Library of The Theological Seminary
PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
ROBERT ELLIOTT SPEER

BS 2651 .P6 1930 c.2
Porter, Frank Chamberlin,
1859-
The mind of Christ in Paul

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/mindofchristinpa00port

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE MESSAGES OF THE APOCALYPTICAL WRITERS

THE MIND OF CHRIST IN PAUL

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
AUG 31 1959
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE MIND OF CHRIST IN PAUL

LIGHT FROM PAUL ON PRESENT PROBLEMS OF CHRISTIAN THINKING

By

FRANK CHAMBERLIN PORTER

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, EMERITUS,
YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
NEW YORK · LONDON
1930

Copyright, 1930, by
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Printed in the United States of America

THE SCRIBNER PRESS

TO

MY WIFE

FOR SHE HERSELF HATH BEEN A HELPER OF MANY,
AND OF MINE OWN SELF.

ROMANS 16:2.

PREFACE

The differences and the likenesses between Paul and Jesus constitute a problem of peculiar importance and difficulty. There is a natural tendency to magnify the differences, and to hold Paul responsible for various departures of Christianity from Jesus. But Paul himself was much more conscious of the likenesses. Was he mistaken in thinking that likeness to Christ was the fundamental fact in his own and in every Christian's experience? Modern historians often express their sense of our good fortune in having the gospels in our New Testament, and not only the letters of Paul. To this no one would hesitate to give hearty assent, but not to the implication that we should have been still more fortunate if Paul's letters had not been there at all. For this would not mean that we should then have had no problem as to the difference and the likeness between the Christian and Christ. The gospels themselves present the problem; it is indeed involved in the nature of the Christian religion. But without Paul, or with only the Paul of the Book of Acts, we should have been without our greatest helper in truly understanding the problem and in working toward its solution in ourselves and in the new world in which we live. For Paul's problem and ours are fundamentally the same.

When therefore the faculty of Yale Divinity School intrusted to me the Nathaniel W. Taylor lectureship for 1929, since this is a lectureship on theology, I chose the subject which appears as the sub-title of this book, as one on which the historical student might properly attempt to make some contribution to present problems of Christian thinking. In making a book of the four lectures I have not meant to change the style and manner natural to one who is speaking; but I have found it necessary to add at many points, and in some places to alter, in the effort after greater clearness and if possible greater persuasiveness. The fourth lecture required much expansion, and almost complete rewriting. The special student will understand the limitations which the character and purpose of such a book as this prescribe in the treatment of so large and difficult a theme as the Christology of Paul. If on the other hand there are readers who find parts of this discussion too technical for their liking, I trust they will see that the decisive reasons for the understanding of Paul here set forth, which in part differs from prevailing views, are of such a sort that all who read the words of Paul in their connection and general bearing and tendency can judge for themselves as to the value of the interpretation. The reading of Paul himself is what I am most anxious to encourage, especially the reading of long connected passages, so that the difficulties of occasional sentences may be lessened and their obscurities cleared by the general movement of Paul's thought and by the total character, the prevailing purpose, and the individual qualities of his mind. Reasonings of this kind have to my own mind peculiar importance, and I prefer to urge them also because it is only by arguments which can be appreciated by people generally that one can hope that his results will have influence. One who finds Paul very great both in mind and in spirit will wish above all to gain and to impart a heightened sense of wonder and uplift in the reading of him, and a fuller appreciation of the significance of his experiences and thoughts for our own religious thinking and life. That Europe became Christian, that is that we ourselves are Christian, is due to Paul more than to any one else. This does not mean that Paul, rather than Jesus, was the author of the Christian religion, with the natural inference that this religion is not what it professes to be, and therefore is not true. But Paul no doubt, more than any other after Jesus, is the creator of the language which is for us the inevitable expression of Christian feelings and ideals. The religion of the spirit finds its vocabulary and its most convinced and convincing demonstration in the letters of Paul. We may well believe that Paul will prove to be the apostle of that freedom and spirituality which we must have if Christianity is to adjust itself to the new knowledge and needs of our new age.

Two matters of detail it is necessary to explain. I have preferred to follow the usage of the English translations of the Bible in not capitalizing personal pronouns referring to God or Christ. The quotations from the letters of Paul, of which the book necessarily contains many, are usually taken from the Revised Version. It may still be necessary to remind those who prefer the Authorized Version, and resent deviations from it, that the changes in the Revision of the New Testament are often due to a different and a more authentic Greek text, not to a difference of literary taste, or an effort to modernize Paul either in speech or in thought. It is because we want Paul's own words that we use the newer version. I have felt free however to depart from the Revised Version at many points in the effort to give a more immediate and living impression of the Greek words which were actually Paul's own, and so of Paul himself.

Paul himself is his greatest message. It is Paul himself whom we must know if we would know not only what he said and did, but what he would now say and do, and so if we would in any real sense learn from him. It is with Paul as with every great man: we need to know not what he shared with his age but what constituted his greatness, that because of which he belongs to every age, and that in which in particular he belongs to our own. There are matters about which every one seems ignorant to those of a later age, matters about which our own knowledge also will be ignorance to those who come after us. Not about things of that kind do we naturally expect light from great men of the past. There are such things in the writings of Paul. Because of them, the study of his relation to Judaism and Hellenism has its rightful and necessary place, and its own rewards; but it is not easy to keep it in its place, and to value more highly the treasures which are of a higher nature than the earthen vessels in which they are contained. This does not mean that we are to select what we like in Paul and explain away that in which we do not find ourselves. We are not to look to Paul to confirm our preferences, but we have a right to seek his help in solving our difficulties. The things that are greatest in him abide, and belong to our age as well as to his. We need to understand Paul as a man of his time; yet it is not Paul's times that will enlighten ours. Our greater need is to know not the man of his time, but the man, Paul himself, as Christ made him after his likeness. It is necessary to understand the differences between Paul and Christ, and also the differences between Paul and ourselves; but the greatness of Paul consists in his likeness to Christ, and also in his likeness to us, his power and right to bridge the centuries and become our contemporary. So he would not hesitate to say again to us what he said to those of his own time—both "Be ye imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ," and also "Become as I, because I also as you, brethren, I beseech you."

FRANK CHAMBERLIN PORTER.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
July, 1930.

CONTENTS

PAGE

I. Jesus in History 1

II. Jesus in the Mind of the Christian 43

III. Thinking about All Things in the Light of Christ 93

IV. Christian Thinking about Christ 135

1. PRINCIPLES AND TESTS 137
2. THROUGH WHOM ARE ALL THINGS 168
3. IN THE FORM OF GOD 204
4. JESUS CHRIST IS LORD 228
5. THE SECOND MAN OF HEAVEN 240
6. THE SON AND THE SONS OF GOD 258
7. THE SPIRIT OF LIFE IN CHRIST JESUS 274

Appendix—

OUTLINE OF TOPICS 321

PASSAGES ESPECIALLY TREATED 325

AUTHORS CITED 327

THE MIND OF CHRIST
IN PAUL

We have the mind of Christ.—I Corinthians 2:16.

Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus.—Philippians 2:5.

I

JESUS IN HISTORY

I

JESUS IN HISTORY

The Christian thinker always faces the problem of adjusting his conceptions of Christianity to change and progress in his thinking about other things. Just now men are asking, some indeed only with curiosity, but many with anxiety, whether the sciences of physical nature, of mind, and of society, allow us to think about God as religion naturally does and likes to do. What changes are involved in our new knowledge of the universe? Does science leave us still free to think of man as having communion with a real God, and as destined to a closer communion with him hereafter? Is there a power behind the universe which is on the side of our higher nature, and is working toward beauty and goodness and truth? But there are also pressing historical questions. Does historical science permit us to speak and think of Jesus as Christians have done and naturally do; and if it requires changes, what place in their religion would modern historians rightly and naturally give to Jesus? For all Christians there can be no religious problem more vital than this: the significance of Jesus himself in the religious faith and life of men; what do we believe it to be, and what should we undertake to make it in ourselves and in our present world?

When one who has been a student of Biblical Theology undertakes to write on theology proper, it is these historical problems with which his special studies incline him to deal. Biblical Theology began indeed as an important part, and almost with the claim of being the whole proper contents, of Doctrinal Theology; but its development consisted in its gradual separation as a purely historical study, with the growing purpose and anxious concern, whatever else it might be, not to be theological or doctrinal in form or spirit. Biblical Theology, it has been said, undertakes to find out, not what is true, but what is truly in the Bible. Yet if Biblical Theology claims to be an impartial and undogmatic science, it is at least among sciences one with which Christian thinking must especially reckon. It is inevitable that Christians should attempt to pass from the question, What is truly in the Bible? to the question, What is true? and the Biblical theologian can hardly escape the second question, and the responsibility of having something to say about the way in which it should be asked and answered. What can we now say of the place of Jesus in history, and what results follow as to his place in our present religious thought and life? Was he? What was he? What is he therefore to us? It is with these questions that modern historical criticism finds difficulty and makes trouble. Does it also point to a way out of the trouble it finds or makes? If the historian can make clearer to theologians how these questions now look to him, he will be doing perhaps the best for theology that he as a historian can do. Yet putting his task so seems to imply that the historian and the theologian are two persons, whereas of course the questions and answers go on and sides are taken and debated within the mind of each man. So let me say, that I am asking myself the question, what sort of Christianity, what experience and what understanding of the Christian religion, remains possible, or, as

I should hope rather to be able to put it, is made possible and becomes natural to one whose chief work has been in historical studies in and about the New Testament.

I have chosen for the task before me to bring these present problems of ours to the Apostle Paul and to seek his help in answering them. It is evident of course that problems which centre in the historical Jesus must be approached first and last through the gospels. But there are reasons for seeking light from Paul. The study of the gospels becomes at once a comparative study. Literary criticism, the higher criticism, is simply the inevitable effort to find the simplest explanation of the complex relationships, the likenesses and differences, that exist between the four gospels, to discover sources common to more than one gospel or peculiar to one, to trace back the course of tradition before the earliest writing, and so by all means at our disposal to work our way back toward Jesus, and especially to determine as well as we can what he said. But there is another main way of approach to Jesus, that which is opened by a knowledge of the environing world. A historian feels that when he gets as near as he can to the very words of Jesus and to the events of his life, he still has before him the task of understanding him. To know what he purposed and to understand what he accomplished, we must know the world into which he came. We need to study not only the literary and traditional sources of our knowledge of Jesus, but the historical conditions and movements which were in a sense sources of Jesus himself, and therefore important means of interpreting him. What was the world into which he came? How did it affect him? What changes in it did he undertake, and what did he effect? We can determine what was new in him and in his words only if we know what was old.

These two ways of approach have been diligently followed for many decades by scholars, among them many great scholars, and our knowledge both as to the sources of the gospel narratives and as to the environing world of Jesus and of Paul has been greatly increased. We are nearer to Jesus than men were a century or a generation ago. Yet it is undoubtedly true that studies along both of these main lines have made us more conscious than we were of the limitations and uncertainties of our knowledge about Jesus. He spoke Aramaic and our gospels are in Greek. He did not write, and what we have has therefore the nature primarily of oral tradition. We are not at best hearing or reading Jesus himself. Something is between him and us. How much stands between, and how certain can we be that we have made our way through the dividing barriers? The impression of uncertainty about the historical Jesus is often expressed, and often in such a way as to give the impression that we know and can know, in the nature of the case, but little as to what manner of man Jesus was; that those who are familiar with the facts and are free from prejudice agree that we cannot really know him; that it is not an entirely unreasonable supposition that his picture in the gospels is the creation of Christian imagination, and that the person there described never existed at all. Many of us who are sure that these assertions of our ignorance are extravagant yet have our times of perplexity as to what we can really know about Jesus, and as to the place which one whose life is now so far away from us and so hard to recover should have and will finally have in our religion. Ought we to be looking for a basis for our Christian faith and hope which will be independent of such historical researches with their disturbing want of finality? It cannot be that our Christian faith depends for its truth and its power upon matters of past fact which are always open to new and critical investigation. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that religion itself can depend on the results of studies which are not in the least religious in their nature. For it is quite evident that neither literary criticism nor the study of the background of Christian beginnings, the environment of Jesus and of Paul, has in itself any religious character. How can matters of which the determination is not conditioned by any religious interest have any important religious consequences? Is there no way of approaching the historical Jesus which is better found and better followed by those who have the incentive and the insight of wonder and love, than by those whose eye is on the past, and whose ideal as historians is to see the past as past? Is there not some way of moving toward greater certainty without moving away from objective and genuinely historical procedure?

In answer to these queries I wish to urge, in addition to the two ways of approach that have been mentioned, the right and importance of a third approach to the historical Jesus. This may be called, paradoxically perhaps, the approach to the knowledge of Jesus through Jesus himself. This seems to mean that we can know him for whom we are looking before we begin or at least before we finish our search. But can any such approach claim to be historical? It is certainly true that by the side of the wide-spread scepticism as to our knowledge of the historical Jesus, there is a still more widely recognized and confidently held impression of the personality of Jesus in its distinctness and in its greatness. People in general who simply read and re-read the gospels, as Matthew Arnold urged all men to do, find that they have a very distinct and powerful impression of the personality of Jesus, of his spirit, of the ideals which he taught, according to which he lived, for which he died. The gospels are not only books having complicated relations to one another which require to be analyzed and accounted for, they are also, all of them, books that have the mysterious power to make the person of whom they tell live before our eyes and take possession of our minds. They are books inspired by a great personality, composed, by however many different minds, by those who were deeply moved by Jesus Christ, who had reverence for his greatness and an exalted sense of the beauty and divine excellence of his character, without which these books could not have been what they are—the most beautiful books in the world. It does not require a historian's training to recognize and to respond to the personal presence of Jesus in the gospels. A simple and genuinely human soul may see it and rejoice in it, and a very good historian may miss it altogether. But it is a reality with which the historian ought to reckon, decidedly a factor that he has no right to neglect. It is his undeniable duty to make use of it for his own ends as a historian. It is something more subtly given in the gospels than the literary facts and the contacts with contemporary events and traditions; and of necessity the perception of it and the value felt in it and the use made of it are more subjective and depend more upon what one *is* than upon what one *knows*. But it is nevertheless a historical fact, and may well become decisive in one's historical judgments. However dangerous a tool this subjective impression may be in the historian's hands, it really belongs among his tools, and I am bold enough to magnify its value.

It is nothing peculiar to the gospels and to the effort to reach Jesus in and through them. The same way is open and cannot rightly be neglected in the study of other great men and great books. It is a way that the man of letters is more likely to find and to pursue than the historian; but that only means that historians need to be men of letters in order to be fully competent as historians. Ultimately what the historian is looking for, or should be looking for, in great literature is the personality that created it and that accounts for its greatness. Those who come into closest and most inward touch with the person himself whose books or the records of whose life they are studying, will understand him best and will be most likely to have the right impression at doubtful points. Whitehead remarks that when we observe nature it appears "closed to mind"; when we adjust our eyes to the external view the internal view is simply out of focus, and the external view appears to be complete and seamless. A similar partial blindness threatens and often afflicts us historical students. When we see what is before and after and around about a great man, or his self-expression in a great book, we seem to be seeing all that there is, and do not feel the necessity of looking within, nor recognize the inward as a region into which strict historical research requires us to enter. Sympathy, fellow-feeling, spiritual likeness, alone can carry us forward toward the apprehension of spiritual realities, that is of persons and personal qualities and relationships. This means in the case of Jesus that only love can understand love; which I am sure is what Paul means when he says that only spiritual men can know spiritual things.

It is evident that this personal approach, this knowing of one person by another in a way which can only be compared to friendship, involves a change in the student's total attitude. A certain assumption of superiority belongs to the mind of the scientist when he is using his knowledge and skill to fathom some strange phenomenon in nature. And the historian also is apt to assume a like attitude in his scientific study not only of things but of persons. The mind has a right to its sense of superiority when it is engaged in mastering physical nature, subjecting to man's understanding and to his uses the facts and forces of the world. And the historian has a certain right to the same sense as long as he is discovering and explaining *things*. But the right attitude of mind toward mind, of person toward person, is not that of superiority and condescension, but that of friendliness, respect, and good-will. And when we are studying great persons the natural sense of the student's superiority to the object of his study rightly gives place to reverence and wonder, to humility and discipleship. One does not cease to be a historian when he tries to understand a great person of the past by the inward means of sympathy and insight. Understanding is surely the object of the historian's efforts, and the understanding of a great personality involves something more than a knowledge of facts. Lives of Jesus which impart no sense of his greatness are surely not more historical because they lack the main thing, because Jesus himself is not seen or felt in them. There is a quality in the gospels that enables every sympathetic reader to draw near to the person Jesus; or one might say, there was a quality in Jesus which is the ultimate reason why the gospels have the power they have of making him live before us and within us. This is pre-eminently a literature, though it is not the only one, where the person most agreeing and most admiring will be the one whose exposition will be truest, and the one who will most help others to a similar adequacy and truth in their understanding. Of course one should guard against letting feeling take the place of knowledge. Historians are inclined to believe that to be the greater danger, rather than the reverse. It is not really so. Knowledge about a great person and the past to which he belongs, and a sympathetic admiration, loving insight and passionate enthusiasm, are not rivals, but rightly work hand in hand.

If we are not renouncing our intelligence, falling back upon mere emotion, when we add this third way of approach to Jesus to the other two; if on the other hand we are perceiving something that is real when we recognize the person of Jesus within and beneath the gospels, then we can welcome this way of approach as giving a sense of security which the others lack, and a knowledge which we feel to be real knowledge of a person who really existed. But is this impression of the personality of Jesus Christ which people generally have, which historians often tend to blur, as real as it seems to a man who is filled with wonder and love when he beholds it? Did the wonder and love of the first Christian decades create it? and do our own love and wonder recreate it in us? How are we to tell? What is really the relation between Jesus in history and Jesus in the mind of the Christian? It is because I am convinced that the Apostle Paul is of the greatest help to us in answering this question that I am turning to him for light upon our present problem.

But why should we turn to the past at all with the expectation of help when our problem is shaped by our modern science and our modern historical spirit and method? Ought we not to make a new beginning with our present knowledge of the world, and construct our religion on the secure foundation of what we know of the world and of man? I would answer by urging the obvious advantage that it would be if our modern Christianity, that is, our new adjustment of our Christian thinking to the thought of our own age, could in some positive and genuine way find its warrant, its right to make such readjustments and to move forward with freedom and confidence, within the New Testament itself. Efforts have often been made, are being and will be made, to make some really new religion, starting from our own knowledge, fitted to the world as we know it. One would be rash to say what possible achievements the future may bring forth, but I cannot doubt that the way which most of us who hold to the name Christian have chosen, the way that starts from the New Testament and from Jesus, is the one that still best fits the needs of our new age. The Christian religion must still be the religion which somehow comes from and centres in Jesus. When it ceases to be that, it must change its name; it will no longer be Christianity. In some way, in spite of questions and fears, the common sense of Christian people, their reasonable instinct, teaches them that Jesus is the most valuable and even the most secure of all their possessions as Christians; that we can indeed lose, without much missing them, many things in the theologies and ecclesiasticisms of the Christian centuries; but that in seeking a substitute for Jesus himself we are needlessly casting aside our chief possession and supreme glory.

But is not Paul the first and most important of the things that we must set aside and can afford to lose in the effort to regain Jesus and build our religion upon him alone? Men have moved away from Paul because they thought of him as the one who moved away from Jesus and substituted for his historical actuality doctrines about him, and for the real following of him an intellectual assent to the truth of those doctrines. Why then should we seek light from Paul? Is it not evident that Paul is much more a man of the past than Jesus is? Is it not the aim and duty of historical science to see Paul as a man of his own time and not to expect him to answer our present problems, an expectation which involves the danger that we shall see what we wish to find and become blind to the realities of Paul himself?

In answer to these questions and doubts, I would say for one thing that Paul's letters are the sort of sources which historians value above almost any other. They are in the highest degree first-hand, immediate and unquestionable testimony. They are Paul's own writing, that is, his personal dictation, and are in the Greek language that he used. We have his veritable words. There are of course questions of the genuineness of certain letters, and occasionally of order and original connection; but about the great letters, those that count most, there is, it can fairly be said, no reasonable scepticism. These are Paul's own. Moreover they are letters, not literary works, not meant by Paul to be parts of the sacred canon of a new religion. They have not the art, the self-consciousness or the self-repression that sometimes seems to separate even very great writings from their authors. Paul's letters are those of a person to persons. They are self-revealing in an extraordinary degree. He writes only because he cannot go and talk in person with the communities to which he has pressing and important things to say. The letters are therefore Paul himself present and speaking. They are written spontaneously and with strong feeling and an immediate and definite purpose. Of course they have to do often, indeed always, with circumstances and conditions of Paul's time, and with ideas of his time and of his own which do not always fit our remote age and our very different situation. The historian might seem justified in saying that the letters of Paul fit so closely into his own time and are so completely a part of his own life and the life of the churches to which and for which alone they were written, that to them peculiarly applies the historian's principle that he should read and understand the past as past. For that particular past they are indeed incomparably vivid, real, immediate and revealing sources. If we had such from Jesus how many of our painful questions would be answered. When we read the stories about Paul in the Book of Acts, important and reliable in the main though they are, and then turn to Paul's letters, we realize how much of his personality vanishes when we have him at second hand, even though the hand may be that of an intimate friend and loyal disciple. The most original of Paul's thoughts, the highest ranges of his feeling and imagination, almost all that was greatest in him, we know from the letters alone. In them we have Paul himself. We know him as we know no other person in biblical history, scarcely any other person in antiquity; and that itself is one of the reasons why his letters, full though they are of their own time, now so long past, impossible as they are to transfer literally and bodily into our present to become, with nothing further done, our own text book of religion and theology, are nevertheless of a wholly unique and priceless value to us. There are many things in Paul's letters which belong only to his time. This is rather an advantage to us than otherwise. His letters are so evidently for their immediate purpose, meant only for those to whom they were addressed, that it is easier to allow for the temporal element in them, and to feel free to distinguish and profit by that which is timeless.

There have indeed been times, and they are not so far back, when the thing most necessary in order to use Paul's letters in their true character was to see things past in them as past. But now it can fairly be said that the greater danger is that of seeing nothing but things past in Paul; and with their eagerness to free themselves from these as from a dangerous burden, many seem entirely to miss not only the treasure of beauty and truth of Paul's writings, but the still greater and priceless treasure of Paul himself. Paul himself is in his letters and speaks through them still. Paul himself is something different from any Paulinism. The unchanging human element is there and the distinguishing and inspiring quality of genius. Here is one of the very greatest men of religion in the history of the world; and in the presence of genius, of supreme greatness, we do not feel that the past is past. We do not look down upon the great souls of former ages from the height of the present, and explain and estimate them with that feeling of superiority which the power to explain and judge so easily calls forth. Wherever there is greatness, there humility and wonder are in place and are the conditions of any true understanding. We know Paul with the sort of knowledge that can go on and up from stage to stage upon the sole condition that we have it in us to learn from him and to be lifted up by the nearness to his spirit which the letters make possible; so that we know him better as we share more fully and make more truly our own his religious insights, his moral ideals, his spiritual energies and enthusiasms.

What we come to know in knowing Paul is chiefly what Jesus Christ meant to him and became in his own inner life. But if this, which was certainly Paul's own conviction, was in any measure true, then in that measure in knowing Paul we are knowing Jesus. And this brings us to the significance of Paul for our own religious problems. We know intimately in Paul's letters the man who perhaps above all others of the contemporaries of Jesus knew Jesus with the sort of knowledge which meant likeness, with an inner communion so intimate that he could say that Christ lived in him, that he lived in Christ. If we are ever tempted to wish that the letters of Paul had been orderly treatises, or that he had repeated in more detail what he knew of the life and teachings of Jesus, we may well reflect upon the fact that it is just because they are what they are that the letters make two conclusions inescapable, their own genuineness, and the historical actuality of Paul. It is of course not impossible to deny both of these conclusions, but it has been done only under the compulsion of some theory of the beginnings of Christianity of which Paul and his letters stand in the way. The personal element in the letters of Paul is too strong and withstands every such assault. Inner evidence of the authenticity of writings is always stronger than outer. The outer evidence is sufficient in the case of Paul's letters, but the inner evidence throughout, the nature of the letters themselves, is such that the opinion that they are fictitious can never hold its own against the common sense of mankind. The genuineness of the chief letters of Paul and Paul's own historicity are certain with the highest sort and degree of certainty that can be had in such matters. We know that he was and what he was. We know Paul himself.

But to know that Paul was historical is to know the historicity of Jesus. The fact of Jesus is confirmed by many evidences. My own conviction is firm that the words of Jesus in the synoptic gospels carry their own evidence; they come from a personality too unique and too great to have been imagined or devised. But perhaps the evidence which is hardest to dispose of by those who try seriously to deny that the Jesus of the gospels ever lived is the Apostle Paul. If Paul was a real person, then Jesus was real. Paul was converted very soon after the crucifixion, three years perhaps. He was in contact with many who had been disciples of Jesus. It is often remarked that Paul shows little interest in the earthly life of Jesus and even in his words, his chief concern being with his death on the cross and with his resurrection. About this there will be more to say presently. But Paul refers to the fact that Jesus was born of the seed of David, born of a woman, born under the law. He happens to have occasion to write the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, because of certain mistaken ideas of it and improper behavior in its observance. He begins, "In the same night in which he was betrayed." He knows the Passion history. In the same letter he has a reason for recounting the appearances of the risen Christ, first to Peter and last to himself. In both cases he says that he is repeating what he had already told them, and what he had himself received. If Paul knew and told these parts of the tradition of the life of Jesus, it is certain that he knew other parts which he did not have occasion to repeat in his letters. Paul knew Peter, and after spending two weeks with him early in his career as an apostle we may be entirely certain that he knew all that Peter could tell him about Jesus. He knew James, the Lord's brother, and John and no doubt others of the twelve apostles, and some of the five hundred brethren to whom the risen Christ appeared, of whom he says the majority were still alive when he wrote. But the reality of the earthly Jesus is taken for granted throughout. The letters of Paul and Paul himself are both completely inexplicable apart from the historical Jesus.

But Paul does much more than testify in a way that can never be reasonably questioned to the fact of Jesus. He also lets us know what manner of man Jesus was. At this point misrepresentation is easy and common. No doubt a certain disappointment is not unnatural. The complaint is often made that there is more of Paul in Paul's letters than of Jesus. Paul to be sure is very much in his letters, but what he says about himself is often said under compulsion and with protest. The Paul who not only sometimes asserts himself but everywhere reveals himself is Paul as Christ had remade him. We shall see that Paul's conception of the Christian religion centres in his experience that Christ lives on in the Christian. In that sense the most that Paul could give would be himself, because his new self was Christ. In reality the letters of Paul not only imply throughout and rest upon the fact of the historical Jesus but they are filled with Jesus himself, with the spirit of love, and love's humility and self-sacrifice, love's glory and power, the love which was the spirit of Jesus as Paul knew him. All that Paul says about love, and all the love that inspires him and controls him, is from Christ and is Paul's witness to what Christ was. His love is first toward Christ, "who loved me, and gave himself for me," and then, like Christ and for Christ is his love for men, for those who love him, and for the unknown in new and strange places to whom he is in debt, who are waiting for him to bring them the gospel of the love of God in Christ.

Paul's testimony to what Jesus was is therefore far more abundant and varied than at first appears. It is found not only in what he says directly about Jesus, but also in what he would have his disciples become, and in what he is conscious that he himself is "in Christ." Paul sometimes directly characterizes Jesus, always as an example to be imitated. "I beseech you by the meekness and gentleness ('the mildness and sweet reasonableness') of Christ, I who in your presence am lowly among you, but absent, bold." "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let each one please his neighbor unto good for his up-building. For Christ also pleased not himself." Looking at the earthly life of Jesus as a whole, as if it were a single act of generous self-giving and lowly self-sacrifice, Paul summons Christians to the same willing poverty that others may become rich, to the same oneness in thought, in love, in soul, the same lowliness of mind, counting others better than self, not looking each to his own things but each to the things of others—which constituted, as Paul expressly adds, the way of thinking and purposing, the mind, of Jesus Christ. The sufficiency of the law of love Paul affirms in words dependent on those of Jesus (Gal. 5:13–14; 6:1–5; Rom. 13:8–10). One word, "Abba," the word in his native Aramaic with which Jesus addressed God, Paul quotes twice in passages of central importance as the characteristic and decisive first expression of the Christian consciousness of sonship (Gal. 4:1–7; Rom. 8:14–17). It is a word which in Paul's feeling was so new as Jesus spoke it that only the divine Spirit, the Spirit of the Son himself, entering into men could account for the wonder of their uttering it. This one word, used as Jesus used it and as he taught his disciples to use it in the "Father" prayer, carried to Paul's mind all the difference between his old religion and his new. The word meant that the oneness of Christ, the Son, with the Father, has become the oneness of disciples with Christ and with God, their like sonship to the same Father, one with Christ's sonship in all things, in freedom, in suffering, and even in glory. This one word, "Abba," is convincing proof that Paul knew what Jesus was, and that the religion of Jesus was the religion of Paul. This one word itself disproves the common opinion that Paul substituted a religion about Christ for the religion of Christ.

Paul seldom describes what the Christian should be without some appeal to the example of Christ. "Forbearing one another, and forgiving each other . . . even as the Lord forgave you so also do ye" (Col. 3:13). "Be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you. Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children; and walk in love, even as Christ also loved you" (Eph. 4:32; 5:1–2). Paul knows that this religion of Jesus becomes the religion of the simple, the ignorant, the childlike, more easily than of the wise and great. Jesus' own words, "I thank thee Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and reveal them to babes," seems evidently echoed and expanded in I Cor. 1:26–31: "God chose the foolish things of the world that he might put to shame them that are wise; and God chose the weak things of the world that he might put to shame the things that are strong."

But we must not look only for direct allusions to the teachings of Jesus in Paul. Paul is not a legalist even in his attitude toward the words of Jesus. Christ set men free, and did not substitute a new bondage for the old, except as the spirit of love may impel one willingly to make himself a slave of men, in a slavery which is the highest act of freedom and the fullest demonstration of the reality of love. But though the words of Jesus are not a new law, yet wherever Paul holds up the ideal of thought and life before Christians, it is evident that to him Christ himself is the source and the substance of the Christian spirit. In all such descriptions of what the Christian's mind and conduct should be and what it should not be, he is giving his testimony to what he knew to be the mind of Christ.

"The love of Christ constrains us" is the principal impelling force of the Christian's life; and the result of that constraint is that we live no longer to ourselves; that we seek not our own; that we please not ourselves. Not ourselves but Christ, not ourselves but others—this is the controlling purpose and end of the Christian's thought and endeavor. Paul repeats these phrases until we realize that they contain the underlying principle of the new life. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control." The new self which the Christian puts on after putting off "the old man with his doings" is characterized as "a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, long suffering . . . and above all these things love." It is hard to realize without longer quotations than are here possible what large parts of the writings of Paul are concerned with setting forth this spirit of Christ in its varied aspects—all of them of divine beauty and grace—in its unworldliness and, in the eyes of the world, foolishness and weakness; but, in the person of Jesus Christ, unveiled in its true nature as the wisdom and power of God.

There are long passages in the letters which consist throughout of interpretations of the principle of living not to oneself and seeking not one's own, and of the spirit of humility and love, as these work out in practice and show their application to the hard problems and complex relationships of life. In I Cor. 8–9 and in Rom. 14 the Christian's freedom and authority is affirmed, but the control of freedom by consideration for others is urged. Paul describes with insight and eloquence what it means to walk in love and to follow after peace in our relationships toward those who differ from us in religious beliefs and practices, those who have not the freedom that we have with regard to everything external. The Christian's liberty as to things that may be eaten, as to days and seasons, rites and ceremonies, is complete; but one who is constrained by the love of Christ will take heed lest this authority of his becomes a stumbling-block to the weak. Paul's principle of becoming all things to all men that by all means he may save some, of bringing himself under bondage to all although he was free from all, is not a weak subserviency to others' prejudices; it is the self-sacrifice of strength, the giving up of the right and power which belong to the Christian without limitation—"all things are ours"—only because it is the love of Christ that has created this freedom, and because only as love is one's freedom really Christian.

In Rom. 12, the new and distinctive Christian wisdom is described, which belongs to those who are shaped not according to this world, but transformed in newness of mind. In I Cor. 1–4 the test of Christlike love is applied to the much prized knowledge which was already dividing the church into rival parties, betraying itself as not a Christian knowledge by the fact that it did not proceed from and issue in love. In II Cor. 8–9 generosity in giving is urged as the imitation of Christ, who was rich, and became poor, that we through his poverty might become rich. In II Cor. 1–6 we may find deep-going reflections on the fundamental question of the Self, the nature of its denial and its affirmation, of its dying and living again, of the loss of the selfish self which Christ effects, and the finding of that new self whose nature is selfless love. In I Cor.

12–14 the same test of the meaning and consequences of Christ's spirit of love is applied to the rivalries and disorders caused by a selfish cultivation and exercise of supernatural gifts; and here in the midst of the effort to subject all such gifts of the spirit to Christ, who is himself their creative spirit, comes Paul's great Hymn to Love. The thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians is not merely the praise of love and the description of its rare and more than human qualities, but it is Paul's standard of values applied to the two things which the Corinthians most prized, extraordinary powers and superior knowledge. It is most characteristic of Paul's Christianity that he puts forth no opinions about the reality and divineness of the gifts of ecstatic speech, prophecy, the faith that works miracles, nor about the truth of the knowledge that these Greek Christians were boasting of. All that Paul is concerned to say about them is that unless they are possessed and used in the spirit of love they are valueless. The presence or absence of love in the Christian's exercise of his special powers and in his pursuit of knowledge is all that counts. It is that which decides the question whether the gifts and the knowledge are Christian or not. The centre of the chapter, the characterization of love itself (verses 4–7), constitutes a picture of Jesus himself, and is derived from him. It has no other historical explanation. So that although Christ is not mentioned in the chapter, it is one of Paul's greatest testimonies to the personality of Jesus, to that which Paul knew him to be. It is a portrait of the character of Jesus drawn by one whom this chapter itself proves to have been a great artist; great, too, in his appreciation of the divine beauty and truth of the mind he is depicting

The qualities that are praised in passages like these throughout Paul's letters are not derived from any known Jewish picture of the Messiah. There is no suggestion of them in the two best and highest descriptions of the Messiah which belong to the period, the Son of Man of the Book of Enoch, and the Son of David of the Psalms of Solomon. Nor are they to be accounted for as due to the Second Isaiah's picture of the Servant. This is indeed a noble figure of vicarious suffering for others' sins, not one's own; but one has only to read the passages in Paul just referred to to see that his ideal is not by any natural process to be discovered in Isaiah, nor developed out of that beginning. Why should Paul's own explanation of its origin be questioned? He uniformly relates it in one way or another to Christ, and derives it from him. It is the mind of Christ, Christ himself. And it was to Paul the new creation which one becomes who is "in Christ," the new man that one puts on who puts on Christ. It is what one becomes in whom Christ is being formed; who is looking at his face and so being transformed into his image. Paul is an excellent and well-informed judge as to what was new and what old in Christ and in Christianity, in comparison both with Jewish and with Greek ideals; and it is fair to say that when he created this picture, with its rare beauty and its far-reaching and truly revolutionary thoughts about the nature of religion and its goal, he was fully conscious that his eyes were beholding a new world, and that Christ was its creator. We have here striking proof that Paul does not need to quote Jesus, nor even to name him, in order that the mind of Jesus may completely possess him, and find worthy expression through him. It is certainly not unreasonable to say that this great chapter, which is Paul's own and Paul at his highest, deserves to be used as a clew to Paul's understanding of the new religion and of Christ, as a test of what Paul believed to be distinctively Christian, and for us a test of what is distinctively Pauline in his letters throughout. It would be an interesting experiment to read Paul's letters with the hypothesis that Paul himself is revealed in this Hymn to Love, that this is what Christianity meant to him, and that nothing is really Pauline into which this will not fit, or which it will not help us to understand.

To this chapter we may well add the two wonderful portraits of the Christian in II Cor. 4:7–18 and 6:3–10. Paul no doubt is painting himself in these portraits, but he says "we," not "I," and he means the Christian, not himself alone. Nothing could be more enlightening in regard to the Christlike spirit, and what it means when it takes possession of a man; and therefore, for our immediate purpose, in regard to what Christ himself was in spirit and in conduct. Both pictures are full of paradoxes, in which both deep feeling and deep insight find expression. They are fundamentally like the paradoxes that Jesus found necessary in order to disclose the unworldly and almost unhuman wonder, the harmony in seeming contradiction, in which really self-denying love and genuine lowliness of mind show their nature and prove their sincerity.

The sayings of Jesus and the sayings of Paul have often been put in parallelism for the sake of showing their contrast and contradiction. But when we put some of the greatest sayings of Jesus by the side of some of the most characteristic sayings of Paul, we need not hesitate to say that Paul's own strong conviction that he had the mind of Christ is justified. "If anyone would come after me let him deny himself." "He that finds his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." "Except ye receive the kingdom of God as a little child, ye shall not attain unto it." "Whoever would become great among you shall be your servant, and whoever would be first among you shall be slave of all." By the side of such sayings as these we may put Paul's "love suffereth long, is kind . . . seeketh not its own . . . beareth all things, endureth all things." "Let no man seek his own, but the other's good." "Always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body." "So then death worketh in us, but life in you." "Be of the same mind, having the same love . . . doing nothing through faction or through vainglory, but in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself." Or compare the beatitudes of Jesus beginning "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," and ending, "Blessed are they that are persecuted," with Paul's "as dying, and beholding we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and possessing all things"; and his, "Wherefore I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong"; and, "For we rejoice when we are weak, and ye are strong." Again, with "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth," "Be not anxious," "Your heavenly Father knoweth what things ye have need of," compare Paul's "In nothing be anxious"; "I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content"; "I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me"; "We know that to them that love God, all things work together for good"; "If God is for us, who is against us?" "Who shall separate us from the love of God?" With "Nothing from without a man going into him can defile him. . . . From within, out of the heart of man, evil thoughts proceed," compare Paul's "Food will not commend us to God"; "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself"; "But if because of meat thy brother is grieved, thou walkest no longer in love." Or, once more, with the "Judge not" of Jesus put Paul's "Let us not judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block in his brother's way, or an occasion of falling."

The Christ of Paul's description of the ideal of Christlikeness is the Jesus of the gospels. During many years of study and instruction about the teachings of Jesus I have found myself turning more and more to Paul for confirmation of what the gospels give, for help to the understanding of the meaning of Jesus, and often for light upon questions which the gospel evidence leaves open. Help is to be had from Paul in regard to Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God, of the Fatherhood of God; still more does he help us as to the meaning of humility, of self-denial, of non-resistance and the love of enemies. Paul's words and his example are often deeply comprehending and helpfully interpreting in regard to these hard sayings of Jesus. So also as to the difficult problem of asceticism, and the related and still unsolved problem of the place and significance of the apocalyptic element in the gospels. Apart from details and above them is the total impression of the personality of Jesus in the synoptic gospels on the one side; and on the other Paul's ideal of the spirit and life of one who is in Christ, and of the greatness as well as the beauty of the humility and love which reveal their divine attractiveness and power in his personality.

If in what Paul says about the Christian's right and duty to be like Christ we can see everywhere the features of Jesus himself, who is to be imitated, whose image should be forming itself within every Christian, then it is inevitable that Paul must have thought of himself as bearing such witness, as preaching Christ, not only by his words but by what he was. And indeed Paul accepts this responsibility of acting and thinking as Christ toward men in language so bold as to give offense to some of his readers. Does not Paul deny his humility and unselfish love by asserting them? Even if this were a just criticism it would still not destroy the validity of his testimony that humility and love were the qualities of Jesus. Let us see, however, how Paul appears when he claims to be like Christ, and calls upon his converts to imitate him. "Be ye imitators of me, even as I am of Christ." When he wrote this he was thinking of the rights that the Christian possesses—"all things are lawful"—but especially of the control of those rights by that love of Christ which conferred them, for it is Christ who set men free. The freedom which love creates is one that will not seek its own, but the other's good. "Even as I also please all men in all things, not seeking my own advantage but that of the many" (I Cor. 10:23–11:1). It is in this that he summons men to imitate him as he imitates Christ. Paul believed that his new Christian self was Christlike; what he was, therefore, what he already was and what he was still striving to become, was to him his most important witness, as it is to us his strongest, as to what Jesus was. The Paul who already was a new creature, but who was pressing on toward a more complete oneness of life with Christ, is for us the fullest expression of what Paul knew Christ to be. Paul believed himself to be like Christ. Is it probable, then, that he took no pains to know what Christ was like? He made the truth of his apostleship depend upon the truth of that claim. If the claim was true then Paul himself is a most important source of our knowledge of Jesus.

Paul's letters are extraordinarily self-revealing. They bring before us Paul himself. But the Paul who uncovers his inner self here is the Paul whose self is Christ. We shall try to understand the nature of Paul's identification of the Christian with Christ in the next chapter. At this point we are interested only in the fact that if Paul believed, as he declares so often and with such emotion, that Christ lived in him, then it must certainly be possible for us to see in Paul what Christ meant to him, the character of Christ as Paul knew it. But it is necessary to clear the way for a better appreciation of Paul's high claims to be, in what he himself was, a witness to what Christ was, by escaping, if we fairly can, the prejudice which many feel against Paul because of the very height of his claims. Do not his strong self-assertions savor of an unchristlike egotism? About this two facts should be kept in mind at the outset. For one thing, the letters in which the self appears were personal and unreserved outpourings of the heart of Paul toward those who knew him well, whom he loved and who loved him. They were not written for the eyes of strangers, nor for future ages and canonical uses. But more important still is the fact that in Paul's view those who accused him, whether of being a weak and despicable person because of the lowliness and hardship of his life, or of being self-seeking in his underlying motives, not only hurt him but denied the truth of his gospel. If a life of lowliness and self-sacrifice is to be despised, then Christ was mistaken and Christianity is not true. Paul became Christian through his vision that the humility, suffering and shame of Christ were acts of love, a revelation of the love of God, and belonged therefore not to things weak and foolish and false, as he had supposed, but to the power and wisdom of God. When men judged Paul as Paul had judged Jesus, it meant that they had not yet the vision of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, which is the primary Christian experience. Upon that vision the truth of the Christian religion completely depends. It is a revelation which, because of its nature, could be made only in a person, received only by a personal experience, and expressed and carried forward only in persons. When therefore men denounced Paul because he did not seek honors and receive advantages from men, because of all that he had renounced, and all that he had endured of hardship and opposition, they were denying the truth of his religion, the truth of Christ himself. A certain self-consciousness and self-assertion do seem necessarily to belong to a religion which has only personality as its means of expression; and yet the personality of Christ is supremely characterized by its unselfishness, its unconsciousness of self. This self-problem is the hardest one to define in the Christian religion, and the hardest to solve. It is harder and much more important than theories even about the person of Christ or about his death, if indeed it is not the fundamental issue involved in the problems of the nature of Christ and the meaning of the cross. For the question, what humility means, what it is to find the self by losing it, is central for the understanding of Christ himself, as well as of the Christian character. The question, what it means to deny oneself, and to be first by being last of all, is beyond all others the characteristic and chief question in regard both to Christ and to the Christian.

One may fairly seek for light from Paul's attitude toward this question upon the attitude of Jesus himself. The central place of personality in the Christianity of Paul is at all events an explanation of Paul's insistence that Christ is really in him, and he in Christ. He does not say, In me alone, nor, In me perfectly—"not that I have already attained"—nor, In me by any virtue or achievement of my own. There is nothing to glory in; glory is excluded. "What hast thou that thou didst not receive?" Yet the lowliness of mind of Jesus and his self-denying love must be in the Christian as his real self. The old selfish self must die to allow the new self which is Christ to take its place. This is essential not only for an apostle, but for every Christian. One who cannot say, Be imitators of me as I am of Christ, is not Christian.

It is in the light or these two considerations, the intimate and confidential nature of the letters, and the fact that the truth of Paul's message was involved, the nature of the gospel itself, the truth of Christ himself, denied, in such attacks as his enemies made upon him, that we should read the various autobiographical parts, whether more apologetic or more self-assertive, of Paul's letters, such for example as I Thess. 2:1–12; Gal. 1:11–2:21; 4:12–20; I Cor. 9; II Cor. 1–2; 7:5–16. The pictures of the Christian in II Cor. 4 and 6, and the account of the typical Christian experience in Rom. 7–8, are also to be reckoned with as self-revealing, although less exclusively personal. It is especially in the Corinthian letters and in Philippians, and not least in Philemon, that Paul reveals himself most freely, with a sincerity which is always convincing. Often when he is not speaking about himself he opens his heart to those whom he loves. The delicacy of his feeling, the warmth and passionateness of his concern and longing for others, find varied, beautiful and moving expression throughout his writings.

Among the passages in which self-assertion is strong we may look briefly at two. Very characteristic of Paul is a passionate outburst to which he is stirred by the boastful and divisive spirit of the Corinthian Christians (I Cor. 4:6–17). It is a contrast, drawn with intense feeling and keen sarcasm, between the apostles and the selfish and self-satisfied Greek Christians, with their wisdom and sense of superiority. They think themselves filled, rich, already kings, wise, and strong; while we, Paul says, are as if doomed to death, a spectacle to the world, weak, dishonored, homeless, persecuted, treated as refuse. And then changing his tone, he entreats them to be imitators of him, and to give heed to Timothy when he comes and reminds them of his "ways which are in Christ." Paul uses here the darkest colors in painting for them the lot of the apostle of Christ, not because he is inwardly protesting against the hardship and suffering, the poverty and contempt that his calling brings upon him, but in order to rebuke the worldliness and selfishness that were destroying their Christianity. He would shame them and shake them out of their complacency by making the way of Christ not easy but hard. The life of complete self-denial looks dark, and should look dark to those who are seeking their own and living to themselves. Paul can paint the picture of Christ-like self-sacrifice in bright colors, for he knows the joys of the sufferings of love. But this picture of himself, of "us the apostles," black though it is, was what those Christians needed to see. Paul is preaching Christ to them again as at the beginning, "Christ, and him crucified." He is preaching Christ not directly in words, but in a living embodiment in himself and others like him. He is describing his ways which are in Christ. Forbidding though the picture is, he draws it not to repel but to attract them. Follow me, he says, "Be imitators of me"; and he hopes that the hardness of the way, and its complete contrast to the selfish and worldly spirit of the culture of Greece, will draw them. This, then, is a striking instance of Paul's preaching Christ when he seems to be preaching himself. The Paul of this terrifying self-portrait is Christ as Paul knew him to be.

The most self-concerned and intimate of all Paul's writings, not improbably a part of the sorrow-bringing letter referred to in II Cor. 2:3 f.; 7:8, is to be found in II Cor. 10–13; and it should be read many times by one who would understand Paul himself. These chapters contain Paul's passionate answer to those who attacked him in order to displace him in the trust and love of the Corinthian Christians, and to substitute, as he believed, not another apostle for himself, but rather another Jesus, a different spirit, a different gospel. They pointed to his humility, his unimpressive personal appearance, his roughness of speech, the absence in him of the gifts of the orator and the philosopher, his receiving no salary but working with his hands for his support, the ill treatment he had met and the hard fortune from his fellow-men, his disgraces, imprisonments and tortures, the toil and sufferings that had filled his days, the special affliction which seemed to mark him as one rejected by God. Is this lowly and despised man the one for a church of cultured Greeks to hold in honor? To all this, Paul's self-defense becomes a wonderful assertion of the nature of self-denying lowliness of mind, the Christlikeness of humility and sacrifice for others' sake. It is a most remarkable human document. I have come back to it often, looking first for a justification for such personal self-assertion in view of the danger that, if his converts lost confidence in him, they would lose his gospel, his Christ, as well. For their sakes he must restore their trust in him. Then there came an increasing impression of the help Paul gives us here in disclosing the nature of true Christian humility, especially the secret of the strength that belongs to it in spite of its seeming weakness, and of the problem, which Paul knew to be hard, of keeping it when it has to be asserted, so delicate a quality it is and so easily spoiled, so easily converted into its opposite. Finally one realizes increasingly how near we are in these chapters to the centre of the problem of the nature of Christianity, of the nature of Christ himself. Christian lowliness of mind meant to Paul, in the light of Jesus, such loss of self as makes possible the incoming of the powers of the other world into our nature, which is, as it were, by nature barred against them. It is for that reason a weakness which is the power of God. It is man's liberation—though it may have the outward guise of slavery—his freedom from the domination of the outward, and from the spirit of this world, which seeks its own and lives to itself.

Paul begins in a strongly personal tone, "Myself, I, Paul." He is writing frankly and emphatically about himself. But he makes at once his main defense by appealing to the character of Jesus: "I entreat you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, I who am [as they tell you] lowly among you." And he ends by likening his own lowly lot and humiliating experiences to the cross of Christ: "Since you seek a proof of the Christ that speaks in me; who toward you is not weak, but is powerful in you: for he was indeed crucified from weakness, but he lives from the power of God. For we also are weak in him, but we shall live with him, from the power of God, unto you." And between these appeals to the example of Christ, which is Paul's vindication, we have the review of Paul's own experiences, about which I cannot but think that if the words were more often read there would be fewer accounts of Paul's Christianity with the personality of Paul left out, and perhaps fewer efforts to account for Paul apart from the Jesus of history.

It is all a powerful affirmation of the sincerity and complete unselfishness of his ministry. It is hard to assert one's love without a strain of self-love seeming to come into the very assertion. It is harder still to affirm one's humility without seeming proud of humility itself. Paul shows a sensitive realization of these dangers. If one reads these chapters with a sympathetic and not a prejudiced mind, my feeling is that he will find himself in the presence of a deeply loving and truly lowly nature. Here is a strong man's genuinely unselfish assertion of self, which is altogether extraordinary. Paul attempts the impossible, one may say, but he comes marvellously near to achieving it. If we ask why should he attempt it, we must say again, because of the nature of the new religion, because it came as a person, and can express and extend itself only in and through persons who, therefore, must exemplify it in their own characters. It is not like the religion of the scribes and their law, nor that of the priests and their ceremonies. The revelation of God, the real presence of God, in such religions, does not depend on the character of those who explain the law or perform the ritual. But in the case of Christ and those who are his, everything depends upon the persons themselves, and upon the love that fully controls and inspires them. Paul must, therefore, declare that his lowly life, laborious, full of perils and sufferings, and of the suspicion and contempt of men, is like Christ's lowliness and suffering and death, for which he also was despised, his cross being the height of foolishness, and an offense, yet in it were revealed the wisdom and power of the love of God.

Glorying is something that Paul does not choose. He used to glory in his conscientiousness and superiority as a Jew; but Christ brought glorying to an end. He will glory here, though it is foolish and even insane to do so, only because others glory against him, and he will glory only in the very things that they condemn and despise. "If I must needs glory, I will glory in the things that concern my weakness." Even in his visions and revelations of many years ago he will glory only as if of another person, not himself; and as to himself he will glory in the weaknesses which make more manifest the strength of Christ which rests upon him. "For Christ" he will think well of his weaknesses, persecutions, distresses; "for when I am weak, then am I strong." In all this, he says, you think that I am apologizing and defending myself to you. But I am not thinking of myself, it is your up-building that I am seeking. It is "in Christ" that I say these things about myself. He speaks in me. He is the one who seems weak, but is strong. God is the source, and you are the aim and end, of this turning of weakness into power. "For we rejoice when we are weak, and you are strong; this also we pray for, your restoration."

There are three words expressive of the mind of Christ and of the Christian, of which Harnack has recently written, pointing out their great influence in the first two or three centuries of Christian literature: the words *gentleness, consideration,* and *lowliness of mind.** It was with these, he says, as armor and weapons that the Christian religion began its conquest of the world. He thinks Paul's appeal to two of these as characteristics of Christ, in II Cor. 10:1, implies his knowledge of some such saying of Jesus as that in Matt. 11:29. It may be so; but it is enough for us to say that it was certainly from Jesus himself and an intimate knowledge of his manner of life, his personality, his mind and spirit, that Paul makes use of these three words. Many things have been attributed to Paul as his original creations for which he was not responsible; but the choice of these words, and perhaps the actual formation of the third

---

**Praütes, epieikeia, tapeinophrosune.*

of them—a Christian substitute for the great Greek virtue of *sanity of mind* (*sophrosyny*)—and making them expressive of the Christian spirit, do seem to be his, and are an important part of his testimony to the mind of Jesus.

It is in the qualities Paul thus puts into language and manifests in his own character that he found the newness of the Christian religion; and he derived them from no source but Jesus himself. These qualities—this single harmonious character, cannot be found in any Messiah of Jewish expectation, nor in any divine wisdom or reason of Jewish or Stoic origin, nor in any dying and rising god of the mystery religions. It is a wholly personal ideal and reality, capable of finding expression only in persons who have laid hold upon it, or rather have been laid hold of by it, as it was first in Jesus. And of such persons Paul was the first whom we know, and we can hardly hesitate to say the greatest.

People generally recognize the greatness of self-sacrificing love, and its Christlikeness. We admire men and women of whom it is evidently true that they are constrained by the love of Christ. But I have the impression that people do not commonly realize that Paul led the way, after Christ and according to him, in this sort of Christian living. Paul was one who suffered the loss of all things that men value, and met dangers and hardships and sufferings as severe as human flesh can endure, in just that spirit of selfless love, and of love's deep joy in suffering for others' sake, in which Jesus met suffering—the spirit which moves us and uplifts our spirits whenever we see it manifesting itself in a human life. The fact that unselfish love makes this appeal to human nature is the chief ground of our conviction that Jesus was right, and that his ideal is the glory of humanity, and our chief assurance of God and of eternal life.

We have said of Paul's letters, Would that we had such from Jesus: so now we might say of the gospels, Would that we had such stories of Paul, which would contain not only the events told in the Book of Acts, but narratives of those acts of Paul which he himself hastily names, or merely alludes to, in II Corinthians (11:23-33); stories of Paul ending in a passion-history at Rome, with his own last words to those with whom he was leaving the treasure which had been intrusted to him; and with some account from those who admired and loved him of his martyr-death. Then we cannot doubt that Christian people would have had a more universal and enthusiastic appreciation of one so great in mind and spirit, so splendid in the completeness of his devotion to his fellow-men. He was great in his possessions of the things unseen which are eternal; great in faith and hope, but greatest in love. He was a leader of men, who knew his powers and his rights, but used nothing for himself; the great apostle of freedom who freely relinquished freedom itself at the instinct and with the wisdom of love, who stood not upon his rights but gladly enslaved himself to men, becoming all things to all; one who in all things bore witness that he had no virtues except such as were first Christ's, which he received from him as one always above and before him, and yet also a presence and power always within him, becoming more and more his real self.

Paul is not chiefly a difficult thinker with whose thoughts about Christ and his death we are chiefly concerned, whether to interpret them so that we can give them our assent, or to set ourselves free from them as not adapted to our view of the world, and so not true to us. He is chiefly one who died daily, with joy if his dying could be life for others; who bore about in his body the dying of Jesus that the life of Jesus might be manifested in his mortal flesh; one who could rejoice when he was weak if others were thereby made strong; who gloried in being poor yet making many rich, in having nothing yet possessing all things.

One realizes the inadequacy of any effort to convey the impression that Paul gives of Christ as he knew him. One can only urge that the letters of Paul be read and re-read with a sympathetic mind toward Paul himself as one who loved Jesus with an intense personal loyalty and devotion, and who saw with reverence and exaltation of spirit the new human nature which can come into being when the spirit of God, the love of Christ, enters into men and takes possession of them.

Paul knew Jesus with a knowledge that wonder and love alone can give. He knew him with the knowledge of reverence toward one greater than himself, and of love toward one who first loved him. He knew him as person knows person, with a knowledge which is not history, nor science, nor philosophy, but friendship. He knew him as one in whom humility and love were revealed, not only in their divine beauty, but in their divine power. He confirms the truth of the general impression of the personality of Jesus which the gospels give to those who seek in them for Jesus himself.

II

JESUS IN THE MIND OF THE CHRISTIAN

II

JESUS IN THE MIND OF THE CHRISTIAN

We have found certain reasons for looking to Paul for light on our present problems in regard to the historical Jesus. Now that we are turning from the question, Was Jesus in history, and what was he? to the question, What is he now and what ought he to be in our present religious experience? we may well point to another reason why it is natural to look to Paul for help. It is a striking remark of Harnack's that Christianity, almost at its very beginning, made two transitions which were more critical and important than any it has had to make in all its later history. The first was the transition from the following of Jesus while he was on earth to a discipleship that could continue after his death, the transition from the presence to the absence of Jesus. The second was the change involved when Christianity passed from the Hebrew world of its origin to the Greek world of its great expansion and extraordinary achievements. Paul did not, indeed, make either of these transitions. He was not the first to face either crisis. But no one else was so important as Paul in the part he took in both of these critical changes and readjustments. Although these transitions were made at the beginning, and no greater ones followed, yet we may truly add that each of them had to be made again and again in Christian history. The two questions were always new and vital, how the Jesus of history was to be related to the Jesus of present Christian experience, and how the Christian faith was to adjust itself to new environments and to advancing knowledge. And these two transitions have never been more necessary and important than they are in our present time. Historical criticism has, as it were, removed Jesus from our earthly life anew, and has made the problem of the connection of our Christian experience with the historical Jesus a new problem; and modern science has made a new world with which religion must make new adjustments. It is natural, therefore, for our own sakes that we take counsel with Paul with regard to these ancient and modern problems, in the hope that his original and fundamental dealing with them may still inspire and direct us.

Paul's Christianity rested upon the historical fact of Jesus, and his nature as the presence in a human person of the Love of God. But his religion was not of the past; it was inward and present. How then did he understand the change that took place when Jesus died? There were different ways in which the transition could be made, and Jesus kept fundamental and central in the life of the disciple. The resurrection and heavenly life of Christ first made discipleship possible. The hope of his speedy return was a powerful motive; and a certain type of the Christian religion could rest almost on that alone. The dangers of this way of meeting the problem can be realized in the Book of Revelation, where Christ is indeed highly exalted, but is scarcely recognizable as Jesus. Paul received this part of primitive Christian faith from those who were Christian before him. He had his own experience of the resurrection, and the future coming had its important place in his Christianity, but by no means the almost exclusive place that some have given to it. The real substance of

Paul's Christianity was Jesus himself, in whom the love of God was present in human life. What then was to take the place of the presence of the love of God in Jesus after his departure from earth? Paul's answer is an exceedingly bold one. Christ's place is taken by those in whom the love of Christ lives on, who have the mind of Christ and are constrained by his love.

The recognition of Jesus as one in whom, and especially in his humility and suffering, the love of God is revealed in its beauty and its power, has two results which follow naturally from it: love to him who loved us with a love so completely self-giving; and likeness to him, which it is the nature of such love to impart or to call forth as human nature's natural response. Love itself is love's best gift. The love of Christ, which is the love of God, imparts itself as the same love to those who see it and feel it in its beauty and glory, and therefore know that there is nothing higher, more divine, more ultimate, more real, than such love. We love one who first loved us, and then we become embodiments of that love toward others. Christ's love and sacrifice were first "for us," but this must mean that our like self-denying love will be "for Christ" toward others, "for others" as if we were in his place. This is certainly the essence of Paul's understanding and achievement as to the first great transition made by the departure of Christ from earth. It means—and in this it consists—a bold identification of the Christian with Christ. Paul understood how bold and new a step it was, and what problems and even perils attended it. He reflected deeply upon it and upon what was involved in it. The secret of it, as of everything in Paul's Christianity, lies in the nature of love itself. If the distinction and greatness of Jesus was the fulness of his possession of a love that denies itself and gives itself freely to those who have no desert, a love that is lowly in mind, gentle, considerate, then an answering love is the only natural response. It is the only real recognition of the divine beauty and excellence of Jesus.

Among the interpreters of Paul, I do not know where to find a clearer recognition of this primary and fundamental element in Paul's conception of Christ and the Christian than that which is given by Jonathan Edwards in his *Treatise on Grace*. He declares, "The very quintessence of all Religion, the very thing wherein lies summarily the sincerity, spirituality, and divinity of Religion, is LOVE." "The first and most fundamental thing in Divine Love and that from which everything else naturally and necessarily proceeds . . . the first effect of the power of God in the heart, is to give the heart a Divine taste or sense; to cause it to have a relish for the loveliness and sweetness of the supreme excellency of the Divine Nature; and indeed this is all the immediate effect of the Divine Power that there is, this is all the Spirit of God needs to do, in order to a production of all good effects in the soul." Edwards of course is interpreting Paul, and he seizes upon what is certainly fundamental for an understanding of Paul's Christianity, namely, that to see Jesus as he was, and to see the divine beauty and excellency of that humility and self-sacrifice which seems to the judgment of the world weakness and foolishness, is the primary and divinely given Christian experience from which everything else follows naturally, freely, and, as Edwards himself says, "after the manner of a principle in nature."

In the first seven chapters of II Corinthians Paul is peculiarly concerned with what one might call the Self-problem in the Christian religion: that is, the problem as to the self-consciousness of the Christian which is involved in the place he must take as Christ's representative, Christ's real presence among men; the problem as to humility and love, and how they must maintain themselves in spite of the great responsibilities, the rights and powers, which the Christian because he is Christian must accept. At the beginning of the letter Paul speaks of sufferings and of some extreme danger of his own as like the sufferings of Christ in this, that their value is in the comfort which they enable us to bring to others in their sufferings, and in the trust which they teach us to have in God, not in ourselves. Then Paul affirms the holiness and sincerity of his behavior toward them. When he changed his plan to visit them, it was not in fickleness, as though his "yes" could mean "no"; and, above all, it was not for any selfish consideration, but solely "to spare you." He had written them a letter which caused them sorrow. Now he wishes only to help their joy. He is himself filled with wonder, almost with awe, when he thinks of the power that he himself has as he goes about the world as an apostle, an ambassador, of Christ. Wherever he goes his words, as God's words, bring death or life to men. It is himself in whom this power dwells, and through his presence it operates; yet though he is himself the bearer of such power, the power is not his. No one would be sufficient for such things. He speaks not from himself but "from God, in God's presence, in Christ" (2: 14–17).

Then, lest he should seem to give himself still a significance of his own, he goes on to remind his readers that they too have a like significance involved in the simple fact that they are Christian. The new religion lives on and comes to expression only in Christian persons. Every Christian shares the high responsibility and authority of being for Christ among men. Paul needs no letters of commendation, such as some carry, for "you are our epistle"; you are my letter of commendation and authorization, the proof of my right to be a messenger of Christ, and I need no written letters. But you are not a letter that I myself wrote; Christ wrote you through me, and you are his letter. Not I only, but you also, are that which Christ has left on earth in the place of the tables of law that Moses took from God and gave to Israel. Christ also has and needs no written words but only the living words of living men, who are, as it were, a writing not with ink, as the commending letters of others are, but with the Spirit of the living God; not on tables of stone, as was the religion of Moses, but on tables that are hearts of flesh. Such, Paul says, are the writings that are proof that I, who am nothing of myself, am sufficient from God, his servant for the imparting of a new religion, a new relation between man and God, a covenant not of the letter which kills, but of the spirit which gives life.

Paul's imagination is kindled as he thinks of the difference it makes that, in the new religion, living persons have become the revelation of God to men. The difference flashes upon his mind, as he reflects upon it, in a new aspect. It is not only that persons become the writing of God to men, instead of commands written on tablets of stone, but that the Christian therefore gives himself as his message, lifts those who receive it from him to his own level, and gives them his own character, so that they also become Christ's letters, standing for Christ, being as it were Christ himself among men. Moses could not do that. He did not impart his high office as the one who saw God and received God's message from God's own hand. The old story tells of the glory, the reflection of the presence of God, which was in Moses' face when he came down from the mountain. Moses was then in a sense God's representative. In his face, and not only on the stones in his hands, God himself was present. But that evident presence of God in the face of Moses was a glory dazzling and even dangerous; for other men cannot look upon the glory of God and live. Moses had to veil his face. Moreover, even for Moses himself it was a glory that faded. The glory was physical. Only the tablets of stone remained. Only these could the Israelites receive and keep. But in the face of Christ there was a greater glory, since he brought a greater revelation, more of God himself. This was a glory that did not fade, that was not physical, but spiritual. It was a glory that did not blind and need to be veiled, but a glory upon which men gladly looked, as at an exceeding beauty. And it was a glory, moreover, that imparted itself to those who looked upon it, and became a glory of the same kind in the face of all, transforming them into the same image. The likeness of Christ, which the vision of the glory of Christ created, made others, therefore, like Christ, God-revealing presences and powers in the world. "Now the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit."

This is the new religion. The prophets of the old religion—of whom Moses was the greatest, "whom the Lord knew face to face"—stood in a unique relation to God. They were and remained apart. God spoke to them, and they spoke as God to the people, saying, "Thus saith the Lord." Not so did Christ take God's place toward men. His oneness with God was of a sort that could and must, because of its inner nature, impart itself whole and entire to other men as their new real selves, Christ's self in them taking the place of the old selfish, separate and separating self. This new revelation is no longer veiled except to those who will to have it so. To all others the gospel, which is the glory of Christ, the image of God, shines in the heart, and gives to each his own knowledge of God, and changes each into the image of God. But although the Christian revelation comes embodied in Christians themselves, Paul must guard against a natural misunderstanding, and indeed a real danger to the Christian himself. "Not ourselves do we preach, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves your slaves for Jesus' sake." Yet, though Paul will not preach himself, his gospel is himself, as the gospel must become the self of every one who receives it; and so at just this point Paul must again affirm himself in the very act of denying himself. The truth of the gospel is a person, and it expresses and demonstrates itself only in persons. If Paul could not point to himself and say, "You can see the gospel, the character of Christ, the Spirit of God, in me," his gospel is not true; but they also, every one, must be able to say the same to those on whom the light has not yet dawned. He is indeed an earthen vessel, unworthy of this heavenly treasure. No greatness or power belongs to him, yet his weaknesses and distresses are themselves a help to men's seeing God through him.

So in the first of the two great pictures of the Christian (II Cor. 4:7–18), Paul depicts himself, and others with him, describing the natural mind and lot of those who represent Christ among men; those who, since the love they represent is self-sacrificing, must not only endure but rejoice in weaknesses and distresses, and realize that their power itself is in self-denials and hardships. The treasure is preserved and imparted only if all of these sufferings are love's self-expressions, are "on your account," and "for the glory of God." "Pressed on every side, yet not straitened; perplexed, yet not unto despair; pursued yet not forsaken; smitten down, yet not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body. . . . So then death worketh in us, but life in you."

There are indeed counterbalancing glories to which the Christian confidently looks forward. Paul does not feel any inconsistency in giving to the sufferings, which belong to the greatness of the Christian, both a value and even a joy now, and also a joy hereafter. He does not find that the selfishness, which was shut out by the Christian's pursuit of his great calling, will slip in again through the hope of future rewards. Christians stand for Christ among men, not only now in sharing his sufferings, which in him belonged to the nature of love and were a source of its power to overcome evil, but also hereafter in having their part in the vindication of Christ by God after death. The constant dying with Jesus means the dying of the outward man as well as the death of the selfish man. The inward man is renewed as the outward decays; and the one who is the incarnation of the love of Christ lives again both in the life of others—"death works in us but life in you"—and also in the unseen world which is eternal. The spirit of Christ which the Christian experiences is itself the pledge, because it is the beginning, of the life at home with the Lord, in which that which is mortal shall be swallowed up (4:16–5:10).

But Paul returns at once to the present and to the place, so lowly and so exalted, of the Christian among men. The passage which follows (5:11–6:10) should be read consecutively, and understood as bringing Paul's reflections on the effect of Christ upon the inner life and new self-consciousness of the Christian to their highest level and greatest expression. Returning to the appearance of self-interest in his defense of himself from the attacks of those who speak against him, he wishes that they could see his inner self as God sees it. They would know then that it is not self-love that prompts him. If he speaks with intensity of emotion, it is to God; if in sober argument, it is for them; in no case is it for himself. "For the love of Christ constrains us." That is the secret of all that the Christian says or does. The death of Christ is the death of all; and the life of Christ is the living of all "no longer to themselves, but to him who for them died and rose." To him, to God, to you, not to self, are all Paul's thoughts and doings as a Christian. And this is the new nature of every Christian. It involves a new *knowing* of all men, as of Christ also—the knowing of love, not the knowing of self-love, which is the natural human way in which men know their fellow-men, and because it is self-centred becomes toward others fear, suspicion, envy, hatred. Feelings such as these had possessed Paul even toward Christ; but now the self that cherished such thoughts is dead, and Paul is possessed and impelled by the love of him whom he once hated and feared.* It is, in its contrast to the self-centred consciousness which is natural to man, a new human nature, which Christ first attained but which belongs to every one who belongs to him. Paul sees that this is the newness of Christ and of Christianity, and adds, "If any one is in Christ, there is a new creation: old things have passed away; new things have come to be."

But Paul is still facing the radical difficulty involved in this new nature of Christ and the Christian. The old human individuality with its fruit of division and contention has been displaced by a personal self-consciousness in which God, Christ, other men, take the place of self as the objects of our concern, love displacing self-love; and yet the person of one who is constrained by the love of Christ, and therefore lives no longer to himself, is not of less but of infinitely more importance than before. The self-emptying of Christ and his cross issued in God's elevation of him to a place of power and glory; and with him the Christian also rises from the death of self to a place of responsibility greater than human nature can bear, and of authority so high that humility, because it is so rewarded, is endangered, and love is threatened by a new pride in love itself.

---

*For a justification of this understanding of II Cor. 5:16, see the author's article on "Does Paul Claim to Have Known the Historical Jesus? a Study of II Cor. 5:16," in *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 1928, pp. 257–275.

Paul feels this danger, especially when he is forced to affirm the sincerity of his unselfishness and of his lowliness of mind. The treasure of Christ is one which only personality can contain and impart. Its bearers can give no message that is not themselves. Paul resents the intrusion of self-regard, yet he must be able to say, "Be ye imitators of me." His way of escape from the danger, and also his way of acceptance of the responsibility, involved in this new nature of Christianity, is the way of turning from himself to Christ, and from Christ to God, from whom alone and not from ourselves is our sufficiency; God, whose image Christ also is, and who alone enables us to see his own glory in the face of Jesus Christ. So he adds, "But all things are from God"; and for a few verses dwells upon the peculiarly divine side of the new life (II Cor. 5:18 ff.). It is Paul's account of God's changing us from enemies to friends toward him. It was God who in Christ was bringing to an end the enmity of the world toward him. "Reconciliation" seems here easily to lose its real meaning as simply the most natural effort of love; but even more easily does the most striking part of the passage seem to be overlooked, that is, the words which declare that the reconciling work which God did through Christ he now does through us. The ministry of reconciliation is now ours. It is not only Christ "for us" (verse 21), but we "for Christ": "For Christ therefore we act as ambassadors, as if God were entreating through us; we beseech you, for Christ, to be reconciled to God" (verse 20).

So Paul comes back to the high self-consciousness not only of the apostle but of every Christian, and to the question how this can be kept without losing the Christlikeness which constitutes both the nature of the messenger and the contents of his message. Where we should least expect it, Paul has put the Christian in Christ's place. The verses that seem to give him a place wholly unique, go on to give the Christian a place with him and like his. And it would seem to be because this is so that Paul breaks out into the second and a still greater poem, describing the quality, the weakness and the greatness of the Christian life, of the person who is in Christ. The actual character and lot which rightly belong to such ministers of God must serve as the only commendation (3:1; 5:12) which can really justify them in their claims, and guard them against the subtle inner perils that threaten those who make such claims; "Giving no occasion of stumbling in anything, that our ministry be not blamed: but in everything commending ourselves, as ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings; in pureness, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in kindness, in the Holy Spirit, in love unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God; through the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, through glory and dishonor, through evil report and good report: as deceivers, and true; as unknown, and well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and possessing all things" (6:3–10).

We have already referred to this great portrait of the Christian as involving the witness of Paul's ideal of the Christian life to that which he knew Jesus himself to have been. We now look at it as describing the likeness to himself which Christ creates in men, the character and life which justify Paul's conviction that every Christian is, or if he is not, yet can be and should become, Christ himself living on and still carrying forward his own work among men. It forms the climax, of the long passage, which we have been reviewing, in which Paul develops his thoughts and discloses his feelings about the high place of personality in the Christian religion, of Jesus as a person, and of Christians as those in whom Jesus continues his revealing and redeeming work, now that he is here no longer. If the Christian person has the place in the Christian religion which Paul here gives him, we can understand how Paul can say, "Be ye imitators of me, even as I am of Christ," and, "The things that ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do," and still be lowly in mind; and how he can expect and even require every Christian to be able to say the same things. Such a self-consciousness belongs to the personal nature of the Christian religion, and therefore to its continual expression and conveyance in persons and always in new persons. It belongs to the nature of love, which cannot express itself except in persons, and has indeed no meaning except that of a person who loves, no existence except in persons who love one another.

This then is Paul's way of understanding and undertaking the first transition. Jesus in the mind of the Christian is Jesus present still, and subduing all things to himself. Paul's trust in this, which was the method of Jesus, is great in spite of all that disturbed and seemed to disprove it. Paul also knew no other way. The Christian revelation, the Christian redemption, was to him also given in living men and women, and depended upon no other means, not upon new Scriptures, nor creeds, nor ritual, nor organization. This is the newness of the religion of Christ.

Paul has soared very high in his effort to meet every possible criticism of his self-assertions, and in general to explain the self-problem, the place of the "I," in the Christian religion. But now he comes back to the simple purpose which underlies it all. The love between him and the Corinthian Christians, his love for them and theirs for him, must on no account be allowed to lessen. They must know each other only as those who are new creations in Christ should and naturally do know one another, not according to flesh, but according to Christ, according to the spirit of love. For this end of securing and deepening love he has opened his heart wide to them; so do you, he exclaims, open your hearts to me; "for I have told you before, that you are in my heart to die together and to live together." The letter that made you sorrow I regretted; but I do not now regret it, for it has proved your awakening to zeal in the special case that I wrote of. "I rejoice that in everything I am bold among you" (6:11–13; 7:2–16).

We have almost the impression that in these seven chapters Paul is explaining and, in a way, apologizing for the strong self-assertions of chapters 10–13, carrying the whole matter back and up to its ultimate ground in the nature of the Christian religion as first given, and then always newly given, in *living persons;* so that a certain self-consciousness is involved in the very Christlikeness of the Christian. Humility and self-sacrificing love are no doubt most convincing and inspiring when they seem most unconscious, the unconstrained expression of a nature which cannot be anything but loving. It is as such that Paul himself prizes these qualities. But when humility and self-sacrifice are themselves assailed as proof of the falsity, not the truth, of a Christian apostle, as weakness, not strength, or when they are criticised as insincere, meant merely to shield self-seeking behind the pretense of self-renunciation, then defense is inevitable. Their genuineness has to be affirmed, and also their Christlikeness demonstrated, which alone makes it evident that not only sincerity but power belongs to them. The cross of Christ was a "weakness" that disclosed the nature of the power of God.

We should put beside this great discussion another, equally great, in which also the contrast between the old religion and the new is set forth; and here also, not chiefly with argument but with emotion, rising to an ecstatic enthusiasm and vision. In Romans 7–8 the struggle is first described which centres about the self; the warfare within the self that is divided against itself; the contention of two selves for the mastery, with the victory always on the side of the separate and assertive self, the self that stands out over against the law of God and is stirred to greater self-assertion by the fact that the law would control and subject it; the self that affirms its claims and its desires also over against other selves, since it is especially the command which involves the denial of self in love, the command, "Thou shalt not covet," which creates the strongest reaction of self-affirmation. Yet with all the strength of the impulse of selfhood, of freedom, of independence, of separateness both from God and from man, one knows himself to be not free but bound and a slave, yearning above all things, but unable, to gain escape from the very self that dominates him, and victory for the other self, the mind, the inward man, that wills the good but has not power to do it. It was not chiefly the body that resisted that to which the soul gave assent. It was the self that would not give itself up, or could not, to the greater self that claimed it; it was the individuality asserting itself in rebellion against the others who stood in its way, and the Other One who demanded the absolute surrender of its will. It is the fight for harmony, for inner unity, that Paul describes. Man is struggling for a oneness with God which should be not mere surrender, not the annihilation of self, but self-realization; the acceptance of a law that should mean life, not death, to the true self. Then comes the new experience, the deliverance from the bondage which the law had only intensified. A new law, which is not a law but a living personality, comes to displace not only the old law but the old self, with its strong sense of rights of its own; and the man is free because he joyfully surrenders his freedom and becomes one with Christ and with God and with his fellowmen. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death."

Not many Jews shared Paul's struggle; nor indeed has it ever been possible for Jews to understand it. To most of them the Law was their delight and glory. Yet Paul's conflict is deeply human. It is indeed the central problem of religion with which he was wrestling. In a man's life with God how fares it with his individual self? Is not God too great and dominant for us, so that we must lose ourselves, must really die, if we approach his presence? And is such loss of self the true end of human life? Is there no right in those insistent self-assertions that stand in the way of our uniting ourselves with the One who is all and demands our all? To this struggle and to these questions Jesus Christ was, to Paul, the answer. He meant the end of inner warfare; yet its end meant life, not death, to the soul; freedom, not bondage; or death only to the self-centred self, and bondage only such as the impulse and ministry of love inspire. Only paradoxes like those of Jesus himself could express Paul's experience. To Paul it is not only in Jesus that humility and majesty, the place of the servant and the place of the lord, are united; Paul experiences for himself also the greatness of lowliness, the joy of suffering, the power of weakness, which result from one's being constrained by the love of Christ. He would surely not say that "the character of Jesus forbids his possible classification with men"; on the contrary, the classification of all men with Christ is the essence of his gospel. Paul, as a Christian, no longer was struggling against a self that resisted every divine command and every will to good. He had been laid hold of by Christ. He was already, in a real sense, "in Christ," Christ already his life, he already, with Christ, a son of God; and now his struggle is only to become that which he is, not to escape that which he is. This is the difference between Jew and Christian, between the seventh and the eighth chapters of Romans. He was flesh, but is now spirit; and now wills to make his own, by his own choice and achievement, that which is already his real nature by the gift of God, by that Spirit of life in Christ Jesus which has set him free.

In each of the two great passages which we have been trying to interpret, the word "spirit" has an important place. In II Cor. 3, the word defines the difference between the old covenant and the new, and describes the nature of Christ himself as the one who creates liberty and transforms those who look upon him into his own image; while in Romans 8 "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" is the source and the nature of man's new life. It is important, on several accounts, to understand what Paul did with this word spirit; how he applied it to the understanding of our theme, Jesus in the Mind of the Christian, and how he used it in making the first transition—that from the presence to the absence of Jesus. Spirit is the word which the Christian church finally chose to express the way in which the Jesus of history becomes Jesus in the experience of the Christian. It was the word which was added to God the Father and Jesus Christ the Son, in order to express the full contents of the Christian faith. It was a question whether the Spirit should take this third place, or the Church—that is, Christians themselves, who in their individual personalities and in their united life together embodied the same love of God which was first manifested in Jesus himself; but spirit was chosen to express that presence of the love of God which was manifest in Jesus in history, as it is now experienced in the mind of the Christian. It was Paul who fitted the word for this use. Paul knew that there were difficulties and dangers in its use which must be reckoned with and guarded against; most of all the danger that, by using the word spirit, something different from the person Jesus Christ would take his place. If spirit is to mean Jesus still present and active in his own character, as the love of God in human life, then it must be kept fully in subjection to Jesus himself. Spirit must be interpreted and understood by Jesus, not Jesus by spirit, for in the latter case spirit would easily become less than personal, and therefore different from and less than love. This is what Paul undertakes to do; and the way in which he does it is most significant with regard to his thinking about the place of Christ in Christianity.

In order to appreciate the importance and the originality of Paul's use of this word, we must give some attention to its meaning, especially in the Hebrew, but also in the Greek sources, from which it got its signification in the age of Paul. The word spirit in Hebrew was the common word for wind. It could therefore easily mean invisible power, incalculable, not under the control of man, but of very great effect. So the Spirit of God was to the Hebrews the power of God working upon men and through them. Its effects in men were wonders of all sorts, but especially the wonder of prophetic inspiration. The word was shaped by the Hebrew mind, not as a philosophical, nor as a psychological, nor as an ethical, but chiefly as a religious term, to express God's man-ward activities and man's God-ward capacities. It was used to name and explain experiences, usually exceptional, in which man felt the presence and pressure of God. Among the Greeks the word suggested air rather than wind, an invisible, attenuated substance, rather than a mysterious force. To them spirit belonged to nature, not to the supernatural, and came to stand for the highest part and inmost essence of nature, rather than for the highest nature of man. It explained the world as it is, but it did not act upon it, nor upon man, as a force from another world. The Stoics used the word for the ultimate reality, the nature of which was best conceived as ether and fire and air. It not only penetrates and moves and shapes all things, and is the force and life and reason of the universe, but is its material as well. It lent itself to Stoic pantheism. Ultimately nothing exists but spirit.

In the Book of Wisdom in the Apocrypha we find a doctrine of the spirit of God in which Hebrew and Greek elements are united. The spirit is Wisdom's spirit, through which God made and maintains the universe. From the popular Stoicism of the period this Jewish-Greek writer took over the idea that the spirit, whose proper name is Wisdom, is the ultimate energy and substance of the universe. He conceives of it as an all-penetrating, all-moving, all-renewing energy, various yet one, mobile yet steadfast, pervading all things and having power to do all things, ordering and mastering the formless matter of which God made the world. But this writer is more Hebrew than Greek, and finds this Wisdom-spirit, therefore, more characterized by moral qualities than by physical. It is true that without it nothing can exist; but it is true, on the other hand, that it will not enter into souls that are sinful, but will dwell only with those that are willing to be friends of God. It is God's self-revelation and self-communication to man, and is characterized by righteousness, purity, and especially love. Although its subtle presence and motion pervade the universe, yet it is, most of all, the image of God's goodness; and even if it has power to do all things, its supreme task is from generation to generation to enter into holy souls, and make friends of God and prophets.

The use of the word spirit in the Book of Wisdom is significant for more than one reason. It is possible, and even probable, that Paul had read the book. Whether he had, or not, it would have been easy for him to fall into the same unadjusted blending of personal and physical qualities in his use of the word had it not been for the influence of the personality of Jesus upon his thinking. We ourselves have our inheritance from both Hebrew and Greek; and it may be partly due to this fact that there is a wide-spread confusion in the use of this very word in our own day. Shall we look for the Spirit of God without or within? If we look without, helping our vision by telescope or by microscope, and supplementing what can be seen by what seems to be required in order to account for what we see, we shall end with a conception of spirit as a sort of ether, both substance and force, filling the universe and in some way accounting for all that is. However refined, the spirit which we discover by looking without is always material. If, on the other hand, we seek for spirit within, we find ourselves in a totally different region, where the realities that we try to name and to explain are qualities of personality, which have no spatial or physical character whatever. We are often told, by scholars who should know, that the word spirit was never used by the ancients in what we should call an immaterial sense. Let us leave this assertion, which is often applied as a matter of course to Paul, before our minds as we turn to primitive Christianity and to Paul himself with the question, which we should certainly ask first; not the question, Of what nature is spirit? Is it material or immaterial, physical or personal? —but the question, What effects did the early Christians, and what did Paul, attribute to it?

The word spirit was one of the great gifts of the Israelitish mind to Christianity, and through it to the modern world. Christianity, as it began its existence among men, made great use of this great word. It had a great experience which this word was destined to assist and to express. An inflowing of divine energy going forth from Jesus gave to the leaders of the earliest Christianity, and through them to many others, a sense of abounding life and freedom and power, which at first, as was natural, expressed itself in enthusiastic forms and sometimes ran to excess. In the popular view the spirit was still the power that worked miracles and gave knowledge of the future, that showed itself in frenzied excitement and in visionary transport. But as in the Old Testament these emotional and physical experiences were more and more controlled by the ethical character of Jehovah, so in early Christianity the character of Jesus, the memory of his mind and ways, became the regulating principle by which religious enthusiasms were restrained and directed. The Apostle Paul was the great prophet of the Christian doctrine of the Spirit of God. Of all his great achievements in Christian thinking, perhaps none is greater than that which centres about this word. Under the impulse and in the light that proceeded from the life and character of Jesus, he developed, with marvellous sureness and insight, an essentially personal view of the spirit. Paul was by no means a critic of the supernatural. He was himself a man whose spiritual experiences were varied and intense, and in part quite of the old type. He spoke with tongues; he had visions; he worked miracles. Not from without as a rationalist, but from within as a believer, Paul brought forth the criticism which freed the great word spirit from that which burdened it.

Paul found that the exercise of extraordinary gifts among the Christians of Corinth led to disorders and rivalries which could be only offensive to the mind of Christ. I Cor. 12–14 is another of the long discussions which should be read and pondered by every one who would understand Paul. It is his effort to understand and to control the works of the spirit in accordance with the character of Jesus and the assumption that the Spirit of God is his spirit. If this is so, the works of the spirit must be controlled by the impulses and purposes of love. Those gifts must be most valued which contribute most to the common good. The gifts had been valued in proportion to their extraordinary and marvellous character, but they should be valued for the love that prompts them and the ministry of love which they perform. But if love measures the value of the miraculous gifts, or imparts its own value to them, it is not a long step to the recognition that love itself is the supreme gift. This did not mean, in Paul's intention, that something human and natural was greater than miracle; but rather that love itself is the thing most supernatural, most requiring God to account for it. The unity of men in a brotherhood, the dominance of love over selfishness in men's hearts, were to Paul things of greatest wonder and divinest power. Paul's achievement, then, consisted in putting the normal life of the Christian, after the example of Christ, above all abnormal outbursts of feeling and the ecstatic states and miraculous powers which the many prized. This surprising conclusion of Paul's, that love is the most divine effect in human life, was due to the fact that it was the character of Christ, the name, in one word, of his personality, and to the fact of human experience that nothing is so rare and so marvellous as the possession of the power to love as Christ loved. With the wonder of this no vision, or prophecy, or miracle, or wisdom could compare.

Paul's splendid Hymn to Love, the greatest Christian psalm, has its place in the midst of this discussion of the gifts of the spirit not by accident. It is the key to everything in Paul, and would not be out of place in the midst of any of his great discussions of the problems of early Christianity. But it belongs here because Paul's one purpose in this discussion of the gifts was to show that the only spirit which should inspire the Christian's life is the mind of Christ, Jesus himself. Paul would show, to a church that was eager for miraculous gifts and ecstatic experiences and a higher knowledge, the truth that nothing deserves to be called divine unless love inspires it; that the Spirit of God—as Edwards put it, interpreting Paul—is nothing but the Divine Love. "The Spirit of God . . . that holy, divine principle, which we have observed does radically and essentially consist in Divine Love, is no other than a communication and participation of that same infinite Divine Love which is God, and in which the Godhead is eternally breathed forth." There is no possible source, except Jesus himself, for Paul's strange and bold conception that none of the miraculous effects that the religious experience produces, none of the most valued evidences of the operation of supernatural forces in human life, none of the intellectual gifts of the theologian, no knowledge of mysteries, no faith however marvellous in its power, no sacrifice of possessions, or even of life, is of value apart from love.

If we turn from this to ask just what positive effects

Paul judged to be distinctive of this Spirit of God, which is the love of God, the love of Christ, Christ himself, he would answer, perhaps, as in II Cor. 3:17, first liberty, and then transformation into the image of Christ; or as in Romans 8, freedom from the law of sin and of death, and the sense of sonship which enables one to say "Abba," taking upon his lips the very word with which Jesus spoke to God, the word which, since it sums up the religion of Jesus, can certainly claim to be one of the greatest words in the religious vocabulary of mankind. Again, Paul asserts that no one can say Jesus is Lord but in the Holy Spirit. This confession too is a wonder; it is an insight, a revelation, which could come only from God.

Then the effects of the Spirit of God are seen in the Christian character and in the Christian society. To Paul the love of Christ was a new moral ideal; or the eternal love of God had been given through Christ an uncommon and superhuman power over the common selfishness of man. But Paul can use many other words besides love for the miracle of Christ's nature and of the Christian's new self. The fruit of the Spirit, that is, the characteristic supernatural effect from which the presence of God's power in man must be inferred, is "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control." In nothing was Paul's view more strikingly distinguished, not only from the current Jewish but also from the popular Christian view, than in this ascribing of the common Christian virtues, the total Christian life, to the spirit's agency.

But this power not ourselves which makes for righteousness, doing for us what we could not do for ourselves, is not in Paul's view an intrusive and dispossessing presence, an over-mastering power which rules us contrary to our wills. On the contrary the effect of the incoming of the spirit of Christ is a sense of freedom. It is the power of evil, not that of good, which displaces our true selves and enslaves us against our will. The oneness of the Christian with Christ, of which the word spirit is one expression, does not mean that moral effort is unnecessary. Paul knows no conflict between the divine and the human in man's attainment of virtue. "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk." It is no doubt one of the advantages of the word spirit that it is adapted to suggest both the divine energy coming upon us from without, and the voluntary movements of our inmost self, our aspiration and endeavor after the higher life. Paul's conception of the way in which the divine spirit of love can become our very selves can hardly be better expressed than in the words of Edwards. Of the spirit of love he says, "It is the prime and most natural breathing and acting of the Spirit in the soul"; and of the men who receive this grace he writes, "The very Deity does, in some sense, dwell in them. That holy and Divine Love dwells in their hearts, and is so united to human faculties, that it is itself become a principle of new nature. That love, which is the very native tongue and Spirit of God so dwells in their souls that it asserts itself in its own nature in the exercise of those faculties, after the manner of a natural or vital principle in them."

Another effect of the Spirit of God, according to Paul, is peace and unity between men, the creation of a brotherhood. Against every selfish and divisive instinct and effort within the Christian community Paul reacts with indignant condemnation. The differences which cause friction and antagonism should be impossible to those who have the mind of Christ. The differences of talent and calling work together toward a higher unity.

Because Paul attributed the same effects to the divine spirit and to the historical person Jesus Christ, these two almost blend into one. The divine spirit whose supreme work is love is the spirit of Jesus. His earthly life from first to last, and as a unity, was the revelation of divine love; and through his death, which was his love's supreme deed, and through his resurrection, Paul affirms that he became a life-giving spirit. Paul thinks in the most vivid and realistic way of the Spirit of God in the Christian as being the Spirit of Christ, or Christ himself. "The Lord is the Spirit." There was an ancient Hebrew and current Christian phrase, "in the spirit," which expressed the state of man when the power of God came upon him. It commonly meant in ecstasy, or in a vision. But to Paul ecstasy and vision had retired behind Christlike love as the characteristic mark of possession by the Spirit of God: he therefore preferred, and as far as we know he first formed and used, a new phrase after the analogy of the old, the phrase, "in Christ Jesus," which he used far more often and evidently felt to be a more exact and suggestive expression of his meaning. Because it is so much used by Paul and is characteristic of him, it proves the importance to him of the conception of Christ as spirit, but also the degree to which he subjected spirit to Christ. It is his most habitual way of describing the distinctively Christian condition of mind. He can express the same thought, though he does so less often, by the phrase "Christ in me." It is a mistake to take either of these phrases in a materialistic sense. Those who say that Paul's conception of the spirit cannot be immaterial because it was never so to men of ancient times, do not sufficiently reckon with the effect of the person Jesus Christ upon Paul, and upon the world as he saw it. Professor McGiffert, in his *The God of the Early Christians,* infers from Paul's identification of Christ with the spirit that he interprets Christ, the man of recent history, as also the spirit-substance of the mystic's experience; so that he has two Christs, just as he has also two gods—the personal creator of the world and giver of the law, the God of the Jews, and the substantial divinity of mysticism, the impersonal, material spirit within. Against attributing such a dualism to Paul, it would seem almost a sufficient reply to quote a single sentence in which Paul first gives one of his strongest expressions of his sense of inner oneness with Christ, in phrases fully mystical in character, and then goes on with a peculiarly personal declaration of his faith and love toward the person Jesus himself. "I have been crucified with Christ; I live; yet no longer *I,* but Christ lives in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me" (Gal. 2:20). Here are the two Christs side by side, without the slightest consciousness on Paul's part that they are two.

The question whether the Christ-mysticism of Paul was physical or personal in its nature is certainly one of central importance for the understanding of his Christianity. The question is really answered if it is once recognized that love is the supreme and decisive effect of the Spirit of God, and is indeed the real nature of that Spirit as Christ disclosed and imparted it. The Book of Wisdom shows clearly the tendency of Greek influence to make spirit a cosmic conception, and to add a physical nature to the religious conception of it in the Old Testament. In the Book of Wisdom the religious and ethical on the whole keep their preponderance, although when physical properties are attributed to the spirit of Wisdom, as they are in this book, it is very hard to prevent them from getting the upper hand. It easily seems to be a more important knowledge, the knowledge of something nearer to ultimate reality, when we are told that the spirit of God is an ethereal or fluid substance or energy, penetrating all things and moving through all things, constituting their essence and imparting to them life and meaning, than when it is said that the spirit of Wisdom is human in its qualities, intellectual and moral, entering only into holy souls and making them more holy, the creator of virtues, and the way to happiness now and hereafter. But Paul is one who understands that nothing physical has the value or the reality that belongs to the personal. There is no use for Stoic pantheism in the thinking of one who has found reality and value at their highest in the person Jesus Christ. There can be no confusion in his mind between the personal and the "substantial," in Christ, or in God.

There is in Paul no description whatever of spirit as the material substance and energy of the physical cosmos. There are no physical qualities among the effects which the spirit produces. The phrase "in Christ" has indeed been interpreted by some as meaning in an atmosphere or element of a semi-material kind, as if, when Christ became spirit, he became an ether which fills and constitutes the world. But this seems to be a region of speculation in which Paul had no interest. The only places in which his language seems to carry any such implications are his two references to a Logos Christology (I Cor. 8:6, Col. 1:15–17). His attitude toward this type of thinking about Christ will be considered in the last chapter. The word spirit does not occur in these passages, nor does Paul anywhere develop it in this direction; although he may well have had the Book of Wisdom before him, with its suggestions of the way in which such a blending of Hebrew monotheistic, and Stoic pantheistic conceptions might be attempted. In the Book of Wisdom the Hebrew conception of wisdom is interpreted by the help of the Stoic conception of spirit. In Paul the Hebrew conception of spirit is interpreted by the person Jesus Christ.

Paul does, indeed, as we have seen, deal with entirely different kinds of physical effects which were popularly regarded as works of the Spirit of God. To the unphilosophical, unscientific mind of common people, whether Jews or Greeks, outward manifestations, transports, miraculous happenings, the extraordinary and inexplicable in human life, were easily looked upon as evidences of divine intervention, and were desired as experiences and cultivated as powers, to which the word "spiritual" was applied. Paul found "seeking after wisdom" characteristic of the Greeks, and "asking for signs" of the Jews. Yet in the church in Corinth he had to correct not only speculative movements, because they were divisive, but also the cultivation of miracle as evidence of the divine presence, because this also caused rivalry and ill will. The Spirit of God was the Spirit of Christ; and the effect of that Spirit with which Paul was most concerned, the effect in which alone its real nature came to expression, was the Christian, and Christians in their unity, “the church of God.” Paul’s doctrine of the Christian is bound up inseparably with his doctrine of the spirit, and also, as we shall afterward see, with his doctrine of Christ. Christ and the Christian are the two facts which determined for Paul the meaning of spirit in his Christian use of it. Christians are those who possess, or are possessed by, the love of Christ, which lives on in the world in and through them, in its own nature as Christ himself, and as if it were their own natures—which indeed, Paul says, it has really become. Paul can express this new fact of human experience without using the word spirit, but when he does use it, it is to describe this fact in some of its various aspects.

When we approach the matter in this truly Pauline way, it must be evident that we are not moving in the region of physical substances or forces. Paul’s language never leads us into such a region, nor allows us to think that spirit is a third entity, by the side of Christ and the Christian. Why should Paul need a material substance or energy to explain or to express the nature of Christ and the way in which it becomes the nature of the Christian? The flesh which dies when the spirit of Christ lives in us is not the physical nature; it is the selfish and sensual nature of man. To be “in Christ” is to be no longer in the flesh, yet the bodily life continues as before. Already “you are not in flesh, but in spirit, if indeed God’s Spirit dwell in you. But if one has not Christ’s spirit, he is not his” (Romans 8:9). The great change from flesh to spirit has already taken place, and that itself is proof that the change is not physical. It is true that death ends, as well as sin, for those who receive the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The implications for Paul of his confidence in immortality, and his approach to the conception that the Christian is beginning to experience it already, we shall consider later on. But the oneness of the Christian with Christ is first and fundamentally personal; and whatever physical change the overcoming of death involves, the aim and end is personal, as is the beginning of the Christian experience. "So shall we ever be with the Lord."

What the essential nature of that experience is, the real nature of the oneness of the Christian with Christ, Paul explains with perfect clearness and fresh variety of expression. The fruit of the Spirit—love, joy, peace, and the rest—is simply the character of Jesus. The new garment which is put on when one puts off his old self is a heart of compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, forgiveness —"even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye"—and above all, love. One who dies and rises with Christ dies to selfishness and lives no longer to himself. It is "our old man" that is crucified with him. We rise to walk in newness of life. The oneness of the Christian with Christ is the oneness of love; it is therefore not physical in nature. It is a oneness like friendship, not a oneness like the blending of physical elements, or the transformation of one element into another.

It is Paul's natural instinct to transfer to the Christian whatever may be said of Christ, what is said not only of his character, but also of his lot. We should expect the likeness of the Christian to Christ to show itself in the sharing of those moral and personal qualities which characterize him, in the imitation of his meekness and gentleness, his pleasing not himself, his seeking not his own; we should not expect the Christian to be like Christ in the things that evidently set him apart and make him unique, the events which Christianity from the first regarded as acts of God, and indeed as the greatest of all his acts after the creation of the world—that is, the incarnation of Christ, and especially his death and his resurrection. Yet in fact the boldness of Paul's thought and the seriousness with which he regards the identification of the Christian with Christ lead him to affirm, more often and emphatically than anything else, the oneness of the Christian with Christ in just these things, especially in his death and resurrection. If he regarded these as only acts of God done once for all for us, in our place, then our imitation of them would seem impossible, an idea that we should suppose could never have entered into Paul's mind. But in fact to Paul the cross was not only God's deed, but Christ's; and both as God's and as Christ's it was a deed of love. In Paul's own experience the cross had been an offense; and his Christian experience began with the vision in which the humility and shame of the cross were revealed in their true nature as the supreme expression of the love of God. But in its meaning of humility and self-sacrificing love the death of Christ must become the Christian's death, and his life the Christian's rising to new life in his likeness. Only because Paul looked at the death of Christ as a deed of love, and regarded its redeeming effect as due to the redeeming power of love, does it become in any way conceivable that he could have thought of it both as a mighty deed of God in history, a past deed done once for all, and also as a deed which can and must be repeated in the experience of every one who is like Christ. Christ is throughout the divine love in human embodiment, that is, Christ is a real person who loves as God loves. All that happens to him, as well as all that he does, belongs to and shows forth his love. So that since to be Christian is to be constrained by his love, to have the mind in us which was in him, all the events which show his love must have their truth in us. Sufficient account has hardly been taken in definitions of Paul's Christianity of this most striking fact.

That Paul derived his religion from Jesus would seem to be beyond question; certainly Paul himself could not possibly have given any other account of it. But it is commonly urged, and of course not without grounds, that his religion differed from that of Jesus in the radical point that Jesus was himself the centre of Paul's religion, the object of his worship, while the religion of Jesus centred directly and without mediation in God. Of this difference more will be said in the concluding chapter. At this point it is only necessary to urge that the contrast, as it has just been stated, would certainly not have been recognized by Paul himself as giving a correct impression. The great elements in the religion of Jesus, the belief in God as Father, the experience of sonship, love to God and love to man as the sufficient law of religion—love indeed being not really a law, but called so only because it takes the place of the law—the beatitudes and the paradoxes of the Sermon on the Mount, and other sayings of Jesus about the loss and gain of the soul, about the least and the greatest, about weakness and strength, about the nature of the humility and sacrifice that belong to love—all these things and more, which characterize the religion of Jesus, as we have already seen, find in Paul one who understands them and makes them his own with a fulness of insight, a completeness of appreciation, which has seldom been equalled in Christian history. It must be confessed that more emphasis has been put in most expositions of Paul's Christianity upon his worship of Christ as divine, his belief in the death of Christ as a wholly unique redemptive work of God in history, than upon his more emphatic and certainly more original and astonishing assertions of the oneness of Christians with Christ in all things, and especially in his sonship to the Father, in his death, and in his resurrection.

If these apparently contradictory assertions of Paul about the person and work of Christ, that they are unique, and that they are to be imitated, are not to be accounted for by his having two Christs, the historical person and the substantial spirit of mystical experience, then what explanation can be given? The secret of Paul's Christianity certainly lies here to be discovered, if we are able. How could Paul have united the worship of Jesus as divine and faith in his death as a redemptive deed of God once for all accomplished, with the complete oneness of the Christian with Christ, both in his relation to God and to man, and in his death and resurrection? Even his heavenly life and his coming are transferred to Christians in Colossians: "If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is. . . . For ye died and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory." Paul seems to mean that he would let nothing in the nature of philosophy, and nothing in the nature of ceremonialism or asceticism, stand above Christ himself and the conviction that Christ was in them; so that they must, in accordance with him who is their real life, put away what is unlike him, anger, wrath, lying, and put on a heart of compassion, kindness, humility. Paul certainly reaches a very high point in this passage in his spiritualizing of the Christian's relation to Christ, that is, in his conceiving of it as personal likeness, a relationship of love, and the oneness of nature which only love creates.

A still higher level, if possible, is reached by him in the letter to the Philippians. Here Paul is thinking of himself, and describes his counting all things that he had valued as loss, "for the sake of the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord." What this knowledge is, and what the pursuit of it involves, is described in words which carry with them perhaps even more of Paul himself than any other words from this most self-revealing nature. In regard to the oneness of the Christian with Christ these words are entirely convincing, and prove beyond contradiction that this oneness is not physical but moral, spiritual, personal, in the full sense of those words. For Paul describes not a oneness with Christ that has been divinely given, magically effected through some sacrament, or through some gnosis, but a oneness which is still before him as an ideal, a goal not yet attained but always the object of eager and anxious pursuit. "That I may gain Christ, and be found in him, not having a righteousness of mine own . . . but that which is from God upon faith; to know him, and the power [not the historical fact or physical nature] of his resurrection, and the fellowship [not the explanation] of his sufferings, being conformed to [not taught the mystery of] his death; if in any way I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not that I have already obtained, or am already perfected; but I press on, if I may lay hold on that for which also I was laid hold on by Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself yet to have laid hold; but one thing I do, forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." We have found that I Cor. 13 is a key to the understanding of Paul throughout, and that nothing is Pauline to which this key does not open the door. It may be said with equal emphasis that nothing is Pauline which is contradicted by this last and greatest self-confession, and nothing of which the clew to an understanding is not to be found here. Only the knowledge of Christ which consists in likeness, and is the knowledge of love, only the oneness which is that of the moral nature and of moral attainment, can be described in language such as this. It is a oneness to which the words "physical" and "substantial" have no application.

Even this great passage should not be read by itself; for Jesus in the mind of the Christian is to Paul a present reality as well as an ideal and an endeavor. The tone of Paul's Christian piety is not one of anxiety and uncertainty. Such feelings he had known as a Jew, but now his spirit was that of peace and joy. He presses on, if by any means he may attain, for the ideal is very high; but also he rejoices in the Lord always, and again rejoices; he is in nothing anxious; his heart and thoughts are guarded by the peace of God. He rejoices, and would have others rejoice with him, even if the pouring out of his life for the service of their faith was that which was before him—as indeed it proved to be. If the letter to the Philippians be read entire, one can be left in no doubt as to the nature of the oneness of the Christian with Christ according to Paul.

Paul's purpose was certainly to let Jesus himself interpret the conception of spirit, and not to interpret Jesus by it. And this subjection of the conception of spirit to the person Jesus Christ is an extraordinary achievement, and is most striking evidence of how truly Jesus himself prevails in his thinking. Jesus in the mind of the Christian is love displacing selfishness, is Christ becoming the new self of one who is constrained by him. Paul's dealing with the word spirit is not only a remarkable example of his principle that, for the Christian, Christ himself is the presence and power of the divine, and that it is as Christ, as love, gentleness, humility, self-sacrifice, that the Christian experiences God; but it is also in itself proof that it was Paul's purpose in all directions to bring his religious experiences, feelings, thoughts, and conduct completely under the determining influence of Jesus and into complete accord with his nature. It is this dominance of the personal Jesus which justifies us in saying that Paul was new in his use of the word spirit, that in distinction from both Hebrew and Greek he thought of the Spirit of God, in its effects and therefore in its nature, as personal, not physical, so that we may properly speak of him as spiritualizing the word spirit itself, and as a spiritual Christian thinker in our own natural use of that word—a use which in reality, it may be fairly said, is due to Paul. It is not due to the difference between our view of the world and his. I do not find any parallel to his conception of the word spirit in ancient literature; and I believe it to be a matter about which Paul was not a man of his time. It would no doubt be misunderstood if one should say that he was a modern and not an ancient in the genuinely spiritual meaning that he gave to the word spirit; but my own conviction is that in this matter we have no reason to feel superior because we are for the moment modern. Paul was superior to us not only in the originality but in the quality of his spirituality. He is one from whom we have still to learn if we would understand what the religion of the spirit really is.

There are two things that seem very difficult for us to reach and to hold with any sureness and satisfaction; difficult it would almost seem for many even to wish to attain, their wishes being for something else. The two things are, as to Paul, a spiritual understanding of him; and, as to ourselves, a spiritual Christian religion. The principal light from Paul upon present problems of Christian thinking falls directly here. Paul is very great among the greatest men of spirituality; men, that is, to whom religion is a reality of their inner life, is wholly personal, involving the whole personality, and is not in any sense materialistic, just as it is in no sense self-seeking. The reason he is so, if one may add a reason which is not Paul himself—the reason which Paul himself would give—is that he makes a person the centre and soul of his religion, and that person one in whom love is the centre and soul. Paul puts a person, and this very particular person Jesus Christ, in the place of the objective and particular facts of his religion as a Jew: the fact of Israel as separate from all other peoples, the people of God's peculiar possession; the fact of the Law, the objective revelation of God; the fact of the temple and the priestly ritual. About these objective facts no doubt a spiritual religion was possible, and did exist at all times in Israel, and reached, in some individuals, great purity and elevation. But Paul's conviction was that spiritual religion, personal, inward, free, was very difficult, and universal religion almost impossible, where these were the objective facts and distinguishing particulars. The historical Jesus was also an objective fact, and his death and resurrection; but because he was a person, the outward was naturally experienced as inward and spiritual, in accordance with its nature. Jesus was a person of such a quality that he made it peculiarly evident that the personal is the spiritual, and that the spiritual is in its essential nature personality. Jesus in history becomes naturally and inevitably Jesus in the mind of the Christian; and only that in his nature and experience which was capable of such translation was to Paul of religious significance; but to him this "only" seemed to include all. The experience of Jesus as spiritual, that is, as within, and constituting his new self, was Paul's Christian religion. The particular in it remained very particular, yet its nature was such that it was constantly breaking down particularity, and becoming universal; the nature of Jesus was becoming the nature of all men.

But though the great problem of the relation between the outward, objective elements in religion and the inward and spiritual seems to be put in an entirely new and clear light, and indeed seemed to Paul to be finally solved, by the revelation that Jesus was both objective and apart, and also, in the same character, as himself, was inwardly experienced, yet Paul himself could not altogether escape the problems of the nature of the outwardness and apartness of Jesus, of his relation to the old objective facts of the Jewish religion, and of his right to take their place.

There is a strong tendency in all religions to magnify their distinctive outward features, perhaps because they are distinctive. Men value things which are their own, perhaps simply because they are outward, and men shrink from the uncertainties and the responsibilities of inwardness. Paul himself, as we shall see more particularly hereafter, was involved, in his arguments with Jews and with Greeks, in the effort to define the relation of Jesus to the objective elements in other religions. The danger was imminent, and the history of Christianity proves how great it was, that various conceptions, really outward, not spiritual, which originally had nothing to do with Jesus himself, would force their way into the definitions of his significance, and threaten to take his place. They can be recognized by the fact that they cannot enter into the Christian's own experience; their nature is such that they cannot be spiritually discerned.

It is things of this external nature that have been too much sought out and magnified in Paul, and made into dogmas to be believingly accepted, though their truth cannot be inwardly known. And it is these things that have veiled the really all-determining spirituality of his Christianity. When historians discovered that these things belonged to the world before and about Paul, and were not original with him nor with the Christian religion, it seemed of most importance that their real origin and nature be disclosed, and that men's minds be freed from bondage to them. So it has become common among modern scholars to define the essence in Paulinism in statements about Christ which are quite external to Jesus himself, in terms of the heavenly pre-existence of Christ, his part in the creation of the world, his incarnation, his death as an outward performance, done to him, not by him, a sacrifice, or expiation, or ransom, and his exaltation and apocalyptic coming. One or another of these has been selected and emphasized as the essence of Paul's Christianity. It has been argued, for example, that "the quintessence of Paulinism" consists in his theory of the two great racial acts: Adam and his sin, and Christ and his cross, in their relation to each other. Much better than this it would seem, to go back once more to that New England Calvinist, Jonathan Edwards, who approached Paul by the way of like experiences of his own, and, in the passage already quoted, found the Apostle teaching us that "the very quintessence of all Religion . . . is Love." This is Paul himself; but there are books on Paul in which Paul himself is left out, chiefly because Jesus himself has been left out of the religion of Paul. It seems hard for men to be convinced that the new and great and wonderful thing in Paul was the degree to which the love of Christ constrained him. Scholars seem to be afraid of the word love. And it seems almost equally hard for religious people to believe that love, joy, peace, long-suffering, and the rest, are the highest realities that exist; and that when we say that these were in Christ, and that in these he was like God and had within him the Spirit of God, we are saying the highest things that can be said, whether one defines the highest in terms of value, or of reality. For though the Christ-mysticism of Paul is not physical, but personal—that is, the oneness of the Christian with Christ is not in any sense, however refined, a mixture of two gases or fluids—yet this does not mean that Paul is saying something of less value or of less reality, and omitting or denying something greater and more real that might be said. "Substance" is not greater but less than personality. There is no oneness that is greater than the oneness of love.

In this fundamentally personal quality of Paul's religion it is like the religion of Jesus, which is contained in the word "Abba" and the sense of sonship. "Father" means the certainty that God will give all that love would give and can give; but since love's greatest gift is love, and since love cannot be given to the unloving, the religion of Fatherhood involves a religion of Sonship. That it is God's good pleasure to give us the kingdom does not alter the fact that we cannot receive the kingdom unless we become as little children. Our confidence is that the love of God is without limitation, and that we have nothing to be anxious about, since God knows what we need, and gives without reserve, and cares for the least as for the greatest of men and of things. But to this infinitely gracious side of the love of God, which our human fatherhood understands, corresponds the side that at first appears severe but is no less involved in the nature of love, the hard condition upon which alone the love of God can be received by us, the condition of loving as God loves. Resist not evil, love your enemies, means that the way to sonship is the way of God-likeness. The son can receive the Father's love only as love, not merely as a gift; he must become a son by being perfect as his Father is perfect. It is for this reason that the religion of an infinitely loving God is infinitely high and difficult.

Paul understands this religion of Jesus and its double aspect of grace and severity. He does not substitute the aspect of grace for that of endeavor and achievement. He understands that God's work in us, and our work in and with God, stand side by side, both belonging to the nature of love. "Work out your own salvation, for it is God that works in you." "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk." Paul's instinct is deeply true that no adjustment of such seeming contradictions is needed. Every one who really knows what love is will understand. We are here, beyond doubt, in a region in which Paul's apprehension of Jesus is deep and true. In passing from Jesus in history to Jesus in the mind of the Christian, Paul does not leave Jesus behind, and substitute for the religion of Jesus a new religion about Jesus. In truth the main problems with which Paul deals, whether of thought or of life, are those involved in the nature of love as Jesus revealed it. Paul spends large parts of his letters, as we have seen, in developing various aspects and various applications of this central nature, this "quintessence," of the Christian religion. How is the mind of Jesus to become the mind of the Christian? How does it change man's natural self? What does it do with the self-consciousness and the desires and ambitions of men? How are we to see and rejoice in its beauty? How are we to experience its power? How are we to strive after it as the goal of our endeavor? And the "it" is always Jesus himself; so that the nature and experience of love is his nature and our experience of his image being formed within us, his becoming our true self, "our life."

The self-problem is involved in this experience, and especially in that dying and living with Christ which seemed to Paul the most adequate expression of its nature. The community problem, however, is also involved, the problem of unity and peace in men's life together. "In Christ" and "with Christ" all that belongs to the Christian life is undertaken. We work with him, and so with God; we suffer with him, die, rise again, and are glorified with him. "We are not our own." "None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." The Christian lives also with his fellow-men in oneness of mind, all in co-operation as members of one society; without envy, or ambition, or any feeling or desire or passion that divides; without anything in conduct or spirit that harms. "If meat make my brother to stumble [to sin against his own conscience], I will eat no flesh forevermore, that I make not my brother to stumble"; which is the same spirit as that which prompted the severe saying of Jesus, that whoever caused others to stumble, it were better for him if a great millstone were fastened round his neck, and he were cast into the sea.

How completely all these matters of Paul's chief concern are present problems of Christian thinking and feeling and purpose. We are painfully aware how pressing they are. The truth of Christianity is involved in them; for the truth of Christianity is the truth of Jesus himself. To be Christian is to know that Jesus was right; that the world and man and God are as he saw them. That this nature of Jesus in history may become the nature of Jesus in the mind of the Christian, is the aim of Paul's prayers for his converts, and inspires the passion that often lifts his words to greatness. He looks at everything else in the light of this, and knows that nothing is important but that the divine love which was his own new nature should become theirs.

These two things then Paul knows: Jesus himself, the Jesus of history, the fact of Jesus; and Jesus in the mind of the Christian, the experience that when one not only sees Jesus as he was, but sees his divine beauty and supreme excellency, adding wonder to knowledge, the nature of Jesus imparts itself to men, and the Christian comes to be in Christ, and Christ in him. These two facts Paul knows immediately and inwardly. The nature of each of them and their relation to each other are determined by the nature of love, the love of God. Love, being the nature of Christ, is also the nature of the oneness of the Christian with Christ. Paul no doubt regards it as a supernatural, not a natural, relationship; but supernatural in a sense which does not seek to rise above the nature of love. Jesus does not change his nature in order to enter into Christians and become their new self.

Two characteristics of what is Christian in thought and life result: nothing is Christian which is not according to the historical Jesus himself; and nothing is Christian which is not the free and natural expression of the new man which one becomes in Christ. An always new and truly spiritual theology is involved in these two principles.

III

THINKING ABOUT ALL THINGS IN THE LIGHT OF CHRIST

III

THINKING ABOUT ALL THINGS IN THE LIGHT OF CHRIST

We now come to the problem how the two facts which we have been considering, the fact of Jesus in history, and the fact of Jesus in the mind of the Christian, influence the thinking of Paul about other things. Is there for him a new Christian way of thinking about God, and man, and the world? When we enter into this region, which we might properly call that of the Christian theology of Paul, should we still expect to receive light from him on the problems of our own thinking? Is it not Paul's theology from which the modern world has turned away in order to get back to the religion of Jesus himself? That there is much in Paul's thinking that belongs in his age and not in ours is not to be questioned; but, on the other hand, Paul's theology is not all that has been derived from him, and all that has made appeal to his authority. There is a difference between taking from Paul what we like, or what tradition prescribes, or, if we are historians, what most belongs to the past, and, on the other hand, letting Paul decide what was most fundamental in his Christianity, what his ruling purposes and tendencies were, and what a modern Christian thinking that is really according to Paul would be. Paul's Christian thinking was fundamentally determined by the two principles, that it should be according to Jesus, and that it should be natural and true to one who has the mind of Jesus; and we may be certain that he would be willing, and would even require, that we apply these two tests to his own thoughts before we accept them as ours.

"If any man is in Christ, there is a new creation: the old things are passed away; behold new things have come to be." When we ask what Paul found to be new and distinctively Christian in thought, we may answer without hesitation, in the first place, that the Christian had, in Paul's conviction, a new conception of God. It is "the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God" that has dawned. "It is God that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." The Christian's knowledge of Christ goes forward at once and becomes a like knowledge of God. The right to infer with such confidence that God is like Christ, Paul does not argue. The vision of the beauty and excellence of Jesus is itself a vision of the divineness of his nature. The love that one sees with wonder and transport as he looks upon the face of Jesus, he knows to be the love of God. Jesus himself claimed for men the right to carry themselves boldly with them, and not to try to leave themselves behind, when they enter upon the search for their highest knowledge, the knowledge of God. "If ye, evil though ye are, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father give good things to them that ask him." With that "how much more" we have Jesus' confident contradiction of man's fears and hesitations about thinking of God in terms of the human, and accepting the highest and best in man as nearest to God.

The centre of the religion of Jesus is not far from that "how much more." It implies that God also is a person, and that our knowledge of him is the highest kind of knowledge we have, the knowledge of a person by a person. It is a knowledge that is wonder and reverence, indeed, but that is also love and likeness.

This is a knowing of God which is first God's knowing us; and it is one of the signs of the greatness and truth of Paul's understanding of the Christian's knowledge of God that he likes to speak of it so: "Now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God." To know God is not to know about him as a thing, an object of search and definition; it is to know one who first knows us; and that means—and it can have no meaning different from this—to love one who first loves us. It is in accordance with this that Paul describes the Christian's new knowledge of God as contained in the word "Abba," and speaks of this in such a way as to make it evident that the Christian's thought about God is not a new doctrine to be assented to, but a new experience of sonship; that is, the Christian's knowing of God is that loving by which alone the God whose nature is love can be known.

Certainly Paul, in what he says of the Christian's thinking about God, is fundamentally consistent with the two principles that Christian thinking shall be according to Jesus, and that it shall be natural and inwardly true to every one who has the mind of Jesus. The question whether this simple Christian thinking maintained itself in Paul's mind, and was not modified or supplemented from Hebrew or from Greek sources, is still to be considered; but certainly nothing else can be so fundamental in Paul's thinking about God as this thinking of him in the light of Christ, this seeing his glory in the face of Christ.

It must be equally evident that Paul's fundamental thinking about his fellow-men is also a thinking according to Jesus. Paul thinks of men as he thinks of the man Jesus Christ, and also as Jesus thought of men. He knows men no longer according to the flesh, but according to Christ, or as one constrained by the love of Christ. Jesus was one who loved the publican and the sinner. The Father of Jesus was one who loved the unholy, the undeserving, his enemies. Paul saw in Jesus a revelation of the greatness of humanity. His thought about men is no doubt best understood in the light of his consciousness that all men, without distinction of race or position, were those to whom he was sent as an apostle. To know men according to Christ, and as is natural to one in whom is the mind of Christ, was to know them with the knowledge of love. That highest and best in men, in which we come nearest to knowing God, we are to see not only in Christ but with Christ in other men. We are to be in our total personal attitude as Christ toward men, and are to feel and act toward them as we would toward Christ.

But Paul, the Hebrew, who was by that inheritance most interested in conduct and character, was bound to face, when he went out into the Greek world, his mission field, those whose inheritance as Greeks involved intellectual curiosity, philosophical and scientific attitudes. Their questions in regard to God and man could not be so simply answered by bringing them to the test of the love of Christ.

It is in the Corinthian letters that we should expect to find Paul facing most directly the problem of making the second of the great transitions, that involved in carrying the gospel over from its native Jewish soil to the world of Hellenism. Here it is, in fact, that we do find Paul meeting "theology," and dealing with the problems and dangers that its emergence brought. Theology is a Greek word for a Greek thing. Paul does not use the word, nor is it used in the New Testament; but the thing which used and valued highly such words as *logos, gnosis, sophia,* Paul does meet; and the question how the Christian knowledge, which is love, and this wisdom of the world were to be related to each other was one with which he had seriously to deal.

The first four chapters of I Corinthians are of very great importance, not only in their disclosure of Paul's reaction to Greek thinking, but also in their bearing upon the beginnings and the real nature of the speculative and doctrinal movements that were to have so large a place in history. They are so important a source for our knowledge of the place of theology in the Christianity of Paul that we shall need to study them somewhat closely for our immediate purpose.

In his salutation Paul gives recognition to the gifts of the Corinthian Christians, "the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus," and thanks God "that in everything ye were enriched in him, in all utterance [*logos*], and in all knowledge [*gnosis*]." But the letter proper begins with an earnest and anxious admonition, "I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment." Then he immediately reveals the cause of his anxiety. Contentions have arisen among them, one saying, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; and another, I am of Cephas. Was the Christian religion, transplanted to Greek soil, destined to develop contending sects and rival parties? Against this Paul vehemently protests. The new religion is the religion of love, the worship of love in Christ, and the living of it through Christ in us. Oneness must be, therefore, the primary mark of all its manifestations in life and thought. Christian thinking must be thinking the same thing; not indeed in the sense that there was virtue in mere uniformity, but men's total attitudes must be such as love controls and inspires, such as destroy the barriers of hatred, ill-will, suspicion, that naturally divide men, and such as erect no new barriers between Christians themselves.

Paul had already contended with all his might for oneness between Gentile and Jewish Christians; and in that controversy, of which the Galatian epistle is the vivid and passionate record, he made it clear that, although the gospel meant freedom from the law, it was only by exercising that freedom under the control of a love that denies itself that the Christian spirit could prevail, and the Christian religion maintain itself in that unity which belongs to its nature. And now, not between Jew and Greek, but between Greek and Greek, and not between differences of religious observance, but between differences of thinking, Paul faced the same problem anew and applied the same solution, which is not theological, as in the former case it was not ceremonial. Let differences in your thinking be what they will, he says in effect, for the Christian spirit is the spirit of liberty. The Christian, both in his acting and in his thinking, should follow the promptings of his inner nature as one whom Christ has set free. But his new nature is according to Christ. It is not in accordance with that nature for one to be seeking his own in his intellectual operations, aiming to be superior to others, maintaining his opinions with pride or ill-will.

It is tempting to surmise that Apollos, the Hellenistic Jew, had given the gospel a form more in accordance with Greek ideas of philosophy and theology than Paul had given it; yet Paul has no criticism to make of Apollos for his part in the Hellenizing of Christianity. There is no rebuke of him, such as Paul was forced to utter in Antioch against Cephas because of his Judaizing attitude. It was not those who were saying, "We are of Apollos," or "We are of Cephas," but those who said, "We are of Paul," that caused him to break out passionately with the exclamation, "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized into the name of Paul? . . . Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not in wisdom of word, lest the cross of Christ should be made vain." Christ is so completely the one head and the whole contents of the Christian religion, that the idea of rivalry between his apostles, and of divisions among their disciples, with appeals to their authority, is preposterous. The gospel is not in its nature a speculation, a philosophy, about which sects can divide. On the contrary the very presence of divisions is itself a proof that Christianity is being forgotten or denied. Whatever thinking has that effect is thereby proved to be unchristian, and nothing more need be said about its truth or error. Nothing that divides men is according to Christ. None of the old distinctions among men were left standing by him, and surely no new distinctions among his followers are to be tolerated.

As Paul goes on it becomes evident that it is the Hellenizing tendency at Corinth that he fears, and it is in contrast to it that he defines and defends the simple gospel that he had preached to them at the beginning. The gospel is not a philosophy, not a wisdom of this world. That wisdom had proved itself to be foolishness, for it had been unable to attain to the knowledge of God. This knowledge is now given to those who have no wisdom. So God rebukes men's intellectual pride. That which seems, to those who are called wise, to be foolishness and weakness, proves to be wiser and stronger than men. It is a wisdom which is not conditioned upon learning and culture. You see, he says, that Christians are not the wise and educated. God chose the foolish and weak to put to shame the wise and strong in order that men may not glory before God. He makes divine the things which men despise. The gospel is simple and human because it is nothing but Christ himself; but it is divine because Christ is the deed of the love of God. "From him are ye in Christ Jesus who became wisdom for us from God, and righteousness, and holiness, and redemption." "He who glories let him glory in the Lord." What Paul objects to in Greek wisdom and in the new Greek Christian sects is their contradiction of humility and reverence, of the sense of living not to ourselves, of being not our own. Greek philosophy he evidently thought of as man's unaided search for God; just as Jewish legalism was man's effort after a righteousness of his own. Paul was much afraid of the self in man, the boasting, self-sufficient, self-seeking self, whether he met it in the form in which he knew it so well in Jewish legalism and nationalism, or in the new form of Greek intellectualism and love of praise and of power. Christianity is the opposite of self-assertion in either of these two forms; and we should not expect to find Paul more friendly and complacent toward developments within Christianity which rested on the work of Greek philosophers, than he was toward those that came in from the side of the Jewish scribes. All that Paul says here about the absoluteness of the contrast between the gospel and the world's wisdom, and between the lowly social and intellectual possessions and standing of Christians and Greek ideals of life (1:26–28), shows clearly enough that the Corinthian Christians needed to see the difference between Christian and Greek ideals, not to look for, or to try to create, likeness.

The same purpose is evident when he goes on to describe his own first coming to Corinth. He came not with excellency of speech [*logos*] or of wisdom [*sophia*]. He did announce to them the testimony of God; but this was nothing but Jesus Christ and his cross. "As for myself, in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling was I with you." His word [*logos*] was not in persuasive words of wisdom; but it did exhibit spirit and power. His whole appearance and his message were the opposite of those of the typical Greek teacher; not because he was incapable of making a show of wisdom and assuming the air of superior knowledge, but "in order that your faith should not be in men's wisdom, but in God's power."

Passing by for the moment the remainder of the second chapter (verses 6–16), we find Paul declaring that the Corinthian Christians had not received his message in its fulness. He condemns them as hardly Christians, at most "babes in Christ"; not, so far as appears, because he objects to the new doctrines in themselves, of which they are proud, but simply because there was among them jealousy and strife. This was enough to convince Paul, and it should be evidence enough to them, that they were merely men and not yet really Christians. It was not Christian to divide into factions over Paul and Apollos, the one who planted and the one who watered, since both are fellow-workers with God. The gospel is God's gift and not man's work. It has one foundation, Jesus Christ. Paul claims for himself nothing except that he laid that foundation in Corinth, and laid it well. But what men build on that foundation—whether Apollos, or Peter, or Paul himself—may be better or worse. Only the result will decide. But in any case, good or bad, it has no authority; it is not a foundation on which different sectarian structures can be built. Let each Christian, Paul would say, build on the one foundation so that all may be workers with God and also parts of the rising structure of God's building. If this is the nature of Christianity, then Paul's inference is that those who were trying to formulate and explain the gospel in terms of the science and philosophy of the age—those who were developing Greek-Christian theologies—were only betraying their ignorance by their pretense of wisdom. "Let no one deceive himself. If any one supposes that he is wise in this world age, let him become a fool, that he may become wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."

Then comes the unexpected climax, unexpected in any writer except Paul. All that I have said, he would add, about the foolishness of the gospel in its contrast to the wisdom that you Greeks prize, does not mean that the Christian religion is something small and poor in contents. Simple though it is, and accessible to the ignorant, foolish as it appears to those who compare it with the teachings of philosophers, when one sees that it is the wisdom of God, he knows that it is inclusive of the universe. If it is our knowledge of God, then it is our possession of all things. Paul lifts his criticism of party rivalries and dissensions to a noble elevation, and leaves all jealousy and strife far beneath him, when he exclaims, "For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; but ye Christ's; but Christ God's."

Then, as we have seen him doing in other cases, Paul makes his contention concrete and vivid by describing the gospel as it was exhibited in his own life and that of Apollos and others of its leaders. It is the dark picture of the lot of the apostle at which we have already looked as a self-portrait of Paul as one whose ways are in Christ, and so as a portrait of Christ himself. It is set in sharp contrast to the self-satisfied, ambitious and contentious attitude of the Corinthian Christians. It is a violent contradiction of all Greek ideals of what the life of men should be, the complete self-denial of Christian love over against all self-assertion. The unworldliness, the seeming weakness and folly, and the more than human, the really divine wisdom and power of the gospel of self-renouncing love, could hardly be more effectually demonstrated and overwhelmingly enforced (I Cor. 4:6–13). In the three pictures—that of the Christian (1:26–28), that of Paul as he first came to Corinth (2:1–5), and that of the complete self-denial and humiliation by which Paul and others, who as apostles have the highest place in the new religion, become the lowest of the lowly in their imitation of Christ—we can see clearly Paul's evident purpose to set forth the opposition between the Christian and the Greek ideals of spirit and of life. Paul is not here becoming as a Greek to Greeks. He is using violent means to check the tendency of the Christians of Corinth to be conformed to the Greek world of their past and their environment. If they could understand and accept his appeal, then their Christian profession would mean to them, the Greeks, what it meant to Paul, the Jew, the counting all things that were gain to them to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus.

In the midst of this discussion, of which the meaning and purpose are unmistakable, stands a striking passage (2:6–16) which seems at first reading to be of contrary import. It is significant, no doubt, beyond any other passage in Paul's letters, as an exposition of his gospel in its aspect as wisdom, or of the nature of Christian knowledge; yet its precise signification is not easy to grasp. It certainly bears on Paul's way of dealing with the second of Harnack's great transitions, that from the original Jewish form of the gospel to a form fitted to the nature and needs of Greeks; but it is not clear just what its bearing is. Like the hymn to Love in the same epistle, this passage on Christian Wisdom, or Spiritual Knowledge, is also poetic in form, and is carefully worked out, a finished and very impressive product of Paul's reflection and feeling. In both cases the poems seem to interrupt the connection in which they stand, yet are vitally related to it; which suggests that in each case we have an originally independent composition of Paul's, which he incorporated in his letter at a point where it served his purpose, rather than a spontaneous creation of the moment. Both of these great productions have a relation to the adjustment of Christianity to the Greek world; and both may be said to guard the Christian religion from dangers involved in that adjustment.

We have seen, in the rest of the four chapters in which the poem on wisdom is set, that Paul seems determined to make an absolute contrast between the Christian gospel and Greek wisdom. The wisdom of God, which is Christ, is as completely opposite to the wisdom of the world as is the life that results from it. Each is to the other foolishness. Christianity is not wisdom in the ordinary sense of that word. It is indeed the knowledge of God, but knowledge of the sort that is possible to the ignorant and weak, and even more available to them than to the intellectual and cultured. Paul calls the gospel wisdom only because it takes the place of wisdom as a way to the knowledge of God, which the world's wisdom had not reached; as he calls it law only because it is the way to the righteousness which the law had failed to attain.

But in the hymn to Wisdom it seems that Christianity has its own wisdom, after all; not like that of the Greek philosophers, but apparently like the secret doctrines of some Greek mystery religion. This would seem to be a knowledge of God, not in the sense of a personal relationship, a love to God who first loves us, but of information about high and hidden facts, which was not meant for the many, even among Christians, but only for the superior few. It is this impression which separates this poem from its setting.

But is this first impression correct, and were there these two sides of Paul's thinking about Christian knowledge? Or does Paul really mean here what he means before and after, namely, that the gospel itself, the Christ of every Christian's experience, is the supreme wisdom, the fulfilment of the mystic's as well as the philosopher's hitherto vain search for the knowledge of God? Did Paul really believe that Christianity had a special intellectual treasure reserved for the few in addition to that knowledge of God which is for all, the knowledge which is love? Does the idea of esoteric mysteries fit into Paul's gospel?

Turning, with these questions in mind, to the poem itself, we notice that it is distinguished from what precedes and follows by its use throughout of "we," and not "I." Paul seldom makes that change without a reason, though sometimes the shade of thought or feeling expressed by the change is a delicate one. When Paul begins, "Wisdom, however, we do speak among the perfect," we could easily believe that the plural is merely a literary form. But as we read on it becomes evident that Paul is speaking not of himself alone, and not only of other teachers, but of Christians; and not of some Christians, but of all. When he says, "We received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is from God, that we might know the things graciously given to us by God," we see clearly that Paul is not speaking of a special class of Christians, but of all Christians in distinction from all other men. Even if Paul chose the expression "the perfect" with the analogy in mind of those initiated into a mystery, yet what follows cannot refer to any esoteric wisdom of the few; for Paul is speaking of the divine plan of salvation, the whole preaching of the gospel. And at the end of the section the distinction between "the psychical man" and "the spiritual" can be only the difference between the natural man, apart from Christ, and the Christian. Except for the one phrase, "among the perfect," Paul is speaking throughout, as a Christian, of the wisdom which Christians know, and which those who are not Christians cannot know. The idea of a distinction within Christianity between a class of people who are capable of understanding the deeper wisdom of God, and others who are not, is completely wanting just where the suggestion of the first words, "wisdom, however, we do speak among the perfect," would most lead us to expect to find it.

One verse, the quotation in verse nine, is often taken to mean that Paul is referring to a mysterious and difficult doctrine of the future, and that this is the wisdom which he imparts only to the mature. It can, I think, be made quite certain that this is not the case, and that Paul is not thinking of future rewards here, but that "the things foreordained before the worlds unto our glory" (verse 7), the things that "eye saw not, nor ear heard, which God prepared for them that love him," are simply Christ and the gospel, which all Christians now know. This is indeed a wisdom that has been hidden, but it has now been revealed. It is hidden, and future, and mysterious, no longer. The quotation, which Paul probably thought of as from Isaiah (64:4), he took to be a prophecy, not of something still future, but of Christ and the superhuman glory of the gospel. That it was used by church fathers as from an apocalypse, and as meaning the world to come and its inconceivable rewards, is not a reason for inferring that it meant the same to Paul. Nor is there the slightest ground for supposing that Paul had an eschatology to impart to the few who were worthy of it, which was higher than that which he gave to all unreservedly in his writings, and most fully in this very letter.

That Paul is thinking of the gospel itself, of Christ himself, and not of higher doctrines—as if anything could be higher—reserved for the intellectual, or for the mystic devotee, is strikingly confirmed when Paul says of the "wisdom in mystery which has been hidden, which God foreordained before the world unto our glory," that if the rulers of this world-age had known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. What knowledge would have made the crucifixion impossible? Must it be some advanced Christological speculation, or a doctrine of the ultimate nature of the world, or of future things? Surely not. The primary Christian confessions that Jesus is Christ, and that he is Lord, or either one of these, would have been enough. If the powers, human or demonic, which brought about the death of Jesus had known that he was the Lord of glory, they could not have crucified him. This primary Christian knowledge is sufficient also for the highest attainments in Christian knowing and being, since from it everything else naturally results.

What, then, is the meaning of the opening words, "But wisdom we do speak among the perfect"? I would suggest, as alone in accordance with what actually follows, that Paul says in effect: "You Greeks want a secret and profound 'wisdom,' a knowledge that only the initiated, 'the perfect,' can receive. Well, then, we Christians have the supreme wisdom, the gospel itself, which is the wisdom of God; and we speak it among the perfect, that is, among Christians.

For it is a wisdom of such a nature that it must be experienced in order to be understood. Only those who have it, know it." The hymn to Love supplements this hymn to Wisdom. Love is the knowledge which only those who love can know. Christianity is not a mystery religion; but it alone fully meets the needs to which the mysteries appealed. Paul would persuade Greeks that in Christ they can reach the goal of their own highest desires and needs, the knowledge of God and the life in communion with God.

In Philippians (3:15) Paul again applies the word perfect (full grown) to Christians, and in this case precisely to those who have not reached the goal. They are those (all who read or hear his letter) whom he summons to imitate him just in this: that not having already obtained, or been already *perfected,* he presses on and stretches forward toward the goal. "Let us, therefore, as many as are perfect, have this mind." The perfect are eagerly to pursue the perfection that they have not yet reached. In Colossians also (1:28–29) Paul admonishes and teaches that he may present every man *perfect* in Christ. "Perfect" does not describe any Christian as he is, not even Paul himself, but every Christian in his ideal and at his goal, not the few, but every one.

But, after all this argument, does not what immediately follows require us nevertheless to accept the view that the wisdom Paul speaks among the perfect is something more advanced than the gospel itself? "And I, brethren, was not able to speak to you as to spiritual, but as to carnal [sarkical], as to babes in Christ. Milk I gave you to eat, not meat: for not yet were ye able" (3:1–2). No, these verses will not reverse our judgment, primarily because of what follows them: "But not even now are ye able; for ye are yet sarkical: for whereas there is among you jealousy and strife, are ye not sarkical, and walk according to man? For when one says, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not men?" What, then, we ask, is that advanced doctrine, that higher wisdom, that meat, which the Corinthians evidently lack, because if they had it their jealousy and strife would be impossible? Is it some esoteric doctrine that they need in order to make love prevail in their life together? The proof that they are only babes in Christ, that they are not spiritual, but fleshly, that they are really not Christian, but just "men," is that they are dividing into rival parties. Though Paul begins as if he had not been able to give them the whole gospel because of their immaturity, he goes on to say that they have not received what he gave them, because with all their pride in their advanced and superior type of Christianity, they are still, in the fundamental matter, at the lowest stage and hardly Christian at all. It is perhaps by their claims that his words are shaped. Paul certainly could not have withheld from them the teaching of Christlike love if he had preached the gospel to them at all. But it is just love that they lack. Paul does not charge himself with responsibility for that lack. Under the guise of doing that, he uncovers in reality the emptiness of their claims to be advanced Christians, and exhibits their conduct and spirit as being not Christian even in the most simple and fundamental sense.

Paul was not a believer in esoteric teachings for the learned or for the otherwise advanced few. The simple and seemingly foolish gospel, accessible to the ignorant, was itself the wisdom of God. Since the love of Christ was its essential contents, it could be known only by those in whom this spirit of Christ could come; only by loving can there be any understanding of love. Only one who is in that sense spiritual, who has the mind of Christ, can understand the gospel as the wisdom of God. "We have the mind of Christ," is the culmination of this hymn to the Divine Wisdom, and there is nothing in it which goes beyond the implications of that high claim; nothing could go higher, for there is nothing higher that can be said. Yet this highest claim every Christian must be able to make. "If any one has not the spirit of Christ, he is not his."

An esoteric Christian thinking is not like Jesus, and it is not like Paul. If Paul in the hymn to Spiritual Wisdom refers to a higher level of knowledge which is only for advanced Christians, "the perfect," then we should have to say that he is seriously inconsistent, and, judging by the definitions of Christianity which he himself is giving in this very place, even unchristian. Nothing could tend more inevitably to division, jealousy, a sense of superiority, than the belief of a few that they only were spiritual and possessed a higher knowledge than Christians in general. Paul could not mean this. The "wisdom" of this chapter is the same as the wisdom of the chapters before and after, it is the gospel itself. In the first chapter it is looked at from the point of view of the Greek philosopher, to whom it seemed foolishness; in the second chapter, from that of the Christian, to whom the same gospel is the highest truth and wonder, more than filling the place claimed by Greek sects for their esoteric doctrines.

If Paul had meant in this passage—which we are sure, because of its form, meant much to him—that which it might seem to say when taken apart from its connection, and apart from Paul himself, then we should certainly, in any study of his Christian thinking, be concerned above everything else to know what these matters were which made up the higher stages of his Christian thought, and were available only for the few mature and spiritual minds. Did they constitute a cosmology, a Christology, an eschatology? If Paul put a peculiarly high value upon this advanced wisdom as his special treasure, we should have to judge his Christian thought, his theology, by this. But it is entirely certain that to Paul there is no wisdom higher than the love of God as seen in the face of Jesus Christ, of which the cross was the final expression. This knowledge, as Paul everywhere recognizes, is conditioned; but the condition is nothing but an answering love, not any advanced instruction, nor any intellectual superiority. Only love knows what love is; and it is in that sense a spiritual reality which can only be spiritually discerned. This is the knowledge which the rulers of the world had not known, and because they did not know it, had crucified Christ. This is the knowledge which, though not a science nor a philosophy, yet includes in its range all things in the universe. If one sees the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, then all that is God's and Christ's belongs to him; there is nothing in heaven or on earth, in the present or the future, which can endanger one who knows this love, or can separate him from it. Paul would no doubt be prepared to say to those who boasted of a superior knowledge and of highly valued mysteries, that his knowledge was greater than theirs, and his mysteries higher and deeper. But he would not say that he had secrets in reserve which he could give to them if he wished, and would give when they deserved them. This great poem of Christian knowledge is one of Paul's efforts, and a peculiarly splendid one, to transfer the Christian religion to Greeks, to whom intellectual qualities and the satisfaction of intellectual needs were of great importance. The effort is made without any concession on Paul's part, or any effort to become Greek to the Greeks in the sense of converting the gospel into a Greek philosophy in order to commend it to them. He will only hold up Christ before them as he was, and even on his cross, and ask them in view of him to renounce the selfish and the sensual, and to find in him the satisfaction of that search for wisdom which Paul found the characteristic of their higher life.

In another very remarkable passage, Paul makes the same effort to meet the dangers which the Christian spirit encountered in the atmosphere of Greece. In the eighth chapter of the same epistle we have one of Paul's several answers to questions raised in a letter of the Corinthians to him. In this case the question was "concerning things sacrificed to idols"; and it appears that he is quoting from their letter when he begins, "We know that we all have knowledge." Paul stops with that in order to criticise the spirit which this assertion discloses. "Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up. If any one thinks that he knows any thing, he knows not yet as he ought to know; but if any one loves God, this one is known by him." It would be hard to find a statement, brief though it is, more comprehensive of Paul's total attitude toward the intellectual interest in religion as he saw it issuing from pride and resulting in division and strife. That one is proud of his knowledge is evidence enough that he has no Christian knowledge, that his knowledge has no Christian quality. It is not the knowledge which is love. We should have expected Paul to say, "But if any one is lowly in mind and loves his fellow-man, he is the one who knows God." When he says, "But if any one love God," we see that the Hebrew in him is asserting itself against the Greek in his readers. Paul does not like a profession of faith which begins, "We know." He likes better Israel's great confession of monotheism, "The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and might." But when a man's approach to God is the right one, that of love, not of boastful knowledge, Paul will not say even of him that he knows God. "If one loves God, *that is the one who is known by God.*" The Christian knowledge of God, being, as we have seen, the knowledge of person by person, is essentially the love of person to person. It is necessarily mutual and, in the case of man and God, it comes first from God, and then from man in response. Paul's instinct, therefore, when he is thinking of man's knowing God, is to put God's knowing man before it, or in its place. To the Galatians he writes: "At that time, not knowing God, ye were in bondage to them which by nature are not gods, but now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how turn ye back again?" And in the hymn to Love, "Now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I was known." What would it mean to our theologies, what would it have meant in times past, if this test had been added to the two we have already noted; and men had measured their thoughts about God not only by the tests of likeness to Jesus, and of naturalness to one in whom was the spirit of Jesus, but also by this final test that our knowing of God should be like his knowing of us? Surely these few words of Paul are much more than a rebuke of the Corinthians' proud, "We know that we all have knowledge"; they contain, if we are able to receive it, the fundamental principle and the inner spirit of a truly Christian theology.

Then Paul turns back to their letter to him, and beginning again, quotes: "As concerning therefore the eating of things sacrificed to idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is no God but one. For though there are so-called gods, whether in heaven or on earth; as there are many gods and many lords; yet to us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him." This we may take to be quoted throughout. Paul's answer begins in verse 7, with its emphatic "but." So this is the superior knowledge of which the Corinthians were proud. The last sentence is in form a creed. It is the earliest formal Christian creed that we know. It is not a Hebraic, but a Greek creed in its form, though of course the addition of "one Lord Jesus Christ" makes it Christian. The creed is based upon a Stoic formula. The Stoic emperor, Marcus Aurelius, for example, quoting from an old Stoic source, addresses Nature thus: "From thee are all things, in thee all things, unto thee all things." There is nothing like this in the Old Testament. Paul uses a similar formula in Romans 11:36, at the end of words of adoration which are Jewish in character and are largely taken from the Old Testament: "For from him, and through him, and unto him, are all things. To him be glory forever." The Stoic phrases could help Paul express the humility of adoration; but he would not wish them used to satisfy the pride of intellectual superiority. I have a strong impression that Paul is not the author of this creed. It is not impossible that Apollos may have been its creator. Something like it can be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews (2:10; 1:2–3), which has seemed to many scholars the sort of book that Apollos could have written.

The feeling that Paul did not write this creed of the Corinthians does not rest on any objection that he makes to what the creed asserts; but it is at least striking that his only concern, when he quotes it here, is to correct the spirit in which the Corinthians are repeating it, and the inferences that they are drawing from it. The creed is evidently not to Paul the essence of the Christian religion. The essence of Christianity is love; and the possession of this creed was not producing love in those who prized it, but pride, a sense of superiority and a want of regard for those who could not go so far in their conviction that the idol is nothing, and that the many gods and many lords of common belief did not exist. Paul's comment on this Greek Christian creed of the Corinthians, their adjustment of Stoic pantheism to the Christian belief in God and Christ, consists entirely in one of his strongest and finest expositions of what is really Christian in one's attitude and conduct toward those who are less knowing than oneself (verses 7–13). It constitutes certainly a strange commentary on this striking earliest Christian creed. If the creed had been Paul's own it seems hardly conceivable that he should not have remarked upon its contents; but his interest is solely in urging love, the renunciation of their rights by those who have knowledge for the sake of those who do not have it, and who may be made to sin against their weak consciences by imitating the conduct of the strong. "Through thy knowledge he that is weak perishes, the brother on whose account Christ died. And thus, sinning against the brethren . . . ye sin against Christ." There could hardly be a more striking illustration than this chapter as a whole, of Paul's attitude toward the earliest "Hellenization of the gospel as dogma."

The creed is not characteristic of Paul. We shall come back to its Christological part in the next chapter. The impression that Paul's instinct and inner preference was for the great Hebrew confession of God, the Shema, is confirmed by a passage which is unmistakably Paul's own, and from Paul's inmost self: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? . . . I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 8:35–39). Here is the God, and here the Christ, of Paul's Christian faith. Beside them there are gods and lords many, angels, principalities, and powers. Paul lets them stand, or rather summons them in order to express his confidence that none of them, nor all together, have power to separate the Christian from the love of God. This is not a speculative doctrine, not an intellectual proposition, denying the existence of any divine beings except God and Christ. It is faith itself, love itself, rising in its inner conviction and showing itself superior to all the powers of evil. The Stoic creed leaves us cold. There is nothing persuasive or convincing in it. We ask him who pronounces it, How do you know? How can you prove that all things are from God and through Christ, and that there are no gods but one? We do not challenge the Jewish Shema with such questions, nor these verses in Romans, nor those that end the third chapter of I Corinthians; because they do not profess to be statements of bare fact but confessions of faith, declarations of love. Their proof is in the passion and beauty of their utterance. It rightly makes a difference to us to know how Paul feels and thinks about these matters, even if, when we look at his words literally as stating matters of fact, we are tempted to say that he goes beyond what he knows, that he has no grounds for a knowledge such as is not accessible to us also of all beings and all things in the universe. But that does not matter. Paul has an understanding of Christ, of the love of Christ, and of what it involves, in which we feel that no one in all the history of Christendom has surpassed him. If we repeat these great confessions of Paul's, it is not because Paul spoke with the sort of authority with which a scientist speaks of things that he has observed, but because he speaks with the glow of enthusiasm which kindles our spirits so that we can share in his experience, and can speak his words as if they were our own.

The Stoic creed is not like Paul. Paul really does not seem anxious to deny the reality of other gods. Let there be as many as may be. What is Christian is such love to one God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that we know that if he is for us, nothing can be against us. That is better than to know that no idol is anything, and that there are no gods but one, and far better than to act upon such knowledge in a proud and unloving spirit.

Paul does not quite say that he became a Greek to the

Greeks, though he almost says it in the chapter immediately following (I Cor. 9:19–23). This passage is, at all events, a great disclosure of the spirit and method with which Paul undertook to make the transition from a Hebrew to a Greek expression and interpretation of the Christian gospel. He undertook it not primarily as an intellectual problem, but by an act of self-denial, a sacrifice of his freedom. "Though I was free from all men, I brought myself under bondage to all, that I might gain the more." The effort at intellectual interpretation and proof seems to be wholly in the background. In this characteristic Paul is certainly much more Hebrew than Greek. He appears not to think of formulas or creeds as the way in which the gospel was to be commended to the Greek world. It was persons, not creeds, that were to hold and give the treasure. It is as if he would say of the Corinthian creed, and of all other such formulas, "Hold them, if you like, but the only thing Christian in them is the Christlike spirit with which they are made and in which they are affirmed; only if they come from and issue in love are they Christian."

We should look also once more at that key to everything Pauline, the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians. This, among the many things that it is, should be taken also as an expression of the way in which Paul attacked the problem of the creation of a Greek Christianity. The matter with which he was here immediately concerned, as we have seen, was the value of the various spiritual gifts, and the Christian way of exercising them. But Paul also has in mind the value which the Corinthians put upon prophecy, and especially upon knowledge. The chapter culminates in an emphatic assertion of the partial, obscure, childlike character of our knowledge at its best. We know in part, and our knowledge will be done away. Even prophecy, which is far superior to the gift of tongues and to other supernatural endowments, because it is not chiefly ecstatic but also rational and useful—even prophecy, which seemed lifted above the imperfection of mere knowledge by its more immediate and full inspiration, is also partial and is to be done away. Love only, without which knowledge and prophecy have not even their temporary value, remains. Surely these words, like those at the beginning of the eighth chapter, coming from him who is called the first Christian theologian, who, at all events, proved to be the principal source and stay for theologies from his age to ours, warn us, whether we are dealing with his theology or our own, against all dogmatism, all intellectual pride, and the danger of confusing theories with realities when we apply intellectual words to spiritual things.

Another passage already quoted has its bearing on our present inquiry. The Christian is one who knows the death and resurrection of Christ by dying with him and rising with him. But even in this sense Paul does not regard the knowing of Christ as something attained once for all in the primary Christian experience. In the third chapter of Philippians, Paul describes himself as still striving to know Christ, to know the power of his resurrection, the fellowship of his sufferings; that is, to know the meaning of the sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ through sharing them more fully and making them more completely his own. This is Paul's way of making truer and more worthy his understanding of Christ and his death. How many of his successors among us Christian thinkers are pursuing the knowledge of Christ and of his death and resurrection by such means? To how many of us is the pursuit of this knowledge the pursuit of perfection?

The passages which we have been considering in some detail throw light of an unexpected kind upon the Christian thinking of Paul. They certainly show it to be thinking of a very un-Hellenic type. So far as we have gone, with the problem of the Logos-Christology of Paul still before us, it would seem that he has little interest in Greek ways of thinking about religion. He certainly shows more anxiety that the thinking be carried on in a Christlike spirit, with respect for those who differ and consideration for those who are ignorant, than concern about the question what the thoughts are, and what their intellectual value and truth.

Are we to infer that Paul has no interest in theology as such, but only in religion, only in that knowing of Christ, of God, of fellow-men, which is love, and not in the knowing which is science, or psychology, or philosophy? Paul certainly has some long discussions which must be called theological in character. We should turn now to see of what nature their thinking is. The question naturally shapes itself in this way: If Paul was not a Greek in his Christian thinking, was he a Hebrew? The question whether Paul was more Hebrew or more Greek has been answered with great positiveness in both directions. It sometimes seems as if those who know Judaism best are inclined to regard Paul as a Hellenist; and those who know Hellenism, to view him as a Hebrew. Professor Edwyn Bevan is one whose knowledge of Hellenism will not be questioned. He defines the Hebraic view of the world as "(1) An apprehension of God as righteous Will, Some One who does definite Mighty Acts in the world-process; and hence (2) a conception of the world-process as a process in Time, which embodies a Divine Plan beginning in God's mighty act of creation and leading up to a great consummation in the future; (3) an association of the Divine plan with a Divine community, a 'people of God' chosen to be the vehicle of God's purpose, so that the ultimate consummation . . . is the community redeemed, blessed, and glorious."* In the same volume, Professor Burkitt also says, "The religion of Judaism, above almost all others, was dominated by a Divine Purpose, manifested in Time." In contrast to this Hebrew view, Professor Bevan describes the Greek view as one in which "(1) God . . . tended to become immovable Being, to which man might indeed strive to attain, but which did not do particular acts in the world-process; (2) the world-process was a vain eternal recurrence, a circular movement, leading nowhere; (3) deliverance was attained by the individual when he detached himself in soul from the world." He then defines the essential elements in Christianity as "(1) The belief in mighty, creative, and redemptive acts of God; (2) in a world-plan initiated and carried out by such acts and leading up to a great future consummation; (3) in connecting the world-plan with a Divine community."

So far as these definitions are correct, the Christian view is fundamentally Hebraic, not Greek; and Paul's theology might be expected to consist in efforts to prove that Christ, and especially his incarnation, death and resurrection, are the central Mighty Acts of God in time; and the Christian community the elect people, and heirs with Christ of the

---

*Edwyn R. Bevan and Charles Singer, *The Legacy of Israel.* The Oxford University Press, 1927. Pp. 50 f., 195.

consummation. Paul was certainly far more Hebraic than Philo; and yet Philo's Judaism, weak though it was, as Professor Bevan remarks, disturbed Jews far less than Paul's; because, though Paul was fundamentally a Hebrew at all three points, his understanding of what the deeds and the plan of God in history were, was new and nothing less than destructive of Judaism.

Nothing was newer or more radical in the Christian thinking of Paul than his two declarations, that Christ is the end of the law, and that there is no longer any distinction between Jew and Greek (Romans 10:4, 12). How did Paul come to this radical conclusion? and by what arguments did he demonstrate it? These are two different questions; for if we read Paul's letters as a whole, our impression is that Christ himself was the reason for Paul's conviction that the law was at an end, and that Israel was no longer the people of God's peculiar choice, to whom his promises belonged. It seems clear that Jesus' knowledge of the love of God, the love which Jesus himself revealed and proved, made the religion of law, in Paul's mind, unnatural and impossible. Love, as Jesus knew it, and as in him we see it to be the love of God, means a relation between God and man different from the legal, and contrary to it. As Paul put it, it changes the position of man from that of a slave to that of a son in the house of God. Moreover, if the nature of God is the love of Christ, there is no room for the barriers that existed between nations. "There is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same one is Lord of all, and rich unto all that call upon him." The nature of the new man created in the image of Christ is such that where he is there can no longer be Greek and Jew, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all, and in all (Col. 3: 11).

But though the real explanation of these revolutionary changes in the religion of Paul is Jesus himself, and it is because he is in Christ that old things are passed away, yet, Paul is still a Hebrew, and must explain this transformation by which Law and Israel, which have been God's chief acts in world history, and the key to his purposes, are denied that place. Paul finds it necessary, perhaps for himself, certainly for his fellow-countrymen, to find in the Old Testament itself evidences that the end of the law was God's intention from the first, and that the end of Israel's prerogative also has its place in the divine purpose, although God's promises to Israel will still have their fulfilment. Most of that in Paul's letters which seems to us to have the character of theology, consists of Paul's effort to put Christ and Christians in the place of Law and Israel as the great acts of God through which his purposes for the world are to be fulfilled.

Paul's theology, therefore, is biblical theology; which means that it rests upon an assumption about the nature of the Old Testament inevitable for him, and impossible for us. The conception of a Plan of God, a purpose and a forward movement, is indeed not without its analogy to that sense of rationality, order, and movement, not in a circle but with progress, which the word development suggests to the modern mind. But the view natural to us is perhaps nearer to the Greek Logos-philosophy than to the Hebraic emphasis on the divine will and plan, and the acceptance of the Bible as the revelation of God's deeds and purposes. We do not naturally think of the purpose of the universe as worked out by means of mighty deeds, interventions from time to time in history. It is not in miracles that we expect to see evidences of purpose, and of forces that make for progress. Jesus himself seems to have risen above the conception of a God who must intervene here and there, toward the apprehension of one who is orderly and works through natural processes; one also who is impartial and generous in his fatherly love toward all alike. Intervention and partiality were too evidently characteristic of the operations of the God of Israel in history.

But while we can see the necessity in Paul's situation for such a theological explanation, of the Hebrew sort, of the end of the law and the end of the distinction between Jew and Greek, yet we cannot be mistaken in our impression that the argument is not so true as the conclusion which it is formed to defend. We have a right to apply to the criticism of Paul's Hebraic theology the principles which we may learn from Paul himself, that Christian thinking should be according to Jesus, and that it should be natural to one who has the mind of Christ; that is, Christian thinking should be both dependent on Christ, and free even from him as an external authority. That Paul fully understands this quality in Christian knowledge, we have seen in our studies of II Corinthians 3 and I Corinthians 2. The latter passage in particular expresses the independence, the inwardness, the freedom, of one who has the mind of Christ. It is Paul's greatest expression of what the second of his principles or tests of Christian thinking involves. The Christian is not bound to the Old Testament. Christian thinking is free, from within, not "from man"—natural to the Christian, though not natural to any one else.

But we have found in Paul still another test of Christian knowledge, that which is involved in his saying that our knowing God is first God's knowing us, and is in the end to be like God's knowledge of us. Paul would certainly acknowledge that there is implied in this our right, not only to infer from God's knowledge of us what our knowledge of him should be, but also to derive some insight into the nature of God's knowledge of us from our knowledge of him. As we have a right to use the conception of the Christian's oneness with Christ, not only for the interpretation of the Christian by Christ, but also for the interpretation of Christ by the Christian, so if our knowledge of God is like his knowledge of us, there can be in God's knowledge of men, that is, in his total personal attitude toward them, nothing unloving and nothing unfair. "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated" does not sound to us like "love your enemies that ye may become sons of your Father." There can be nothing inhuman about God's knowing of men, his choices, his purposes concerning them, even though his judgments are unsearchable and his ways past tracing out. It is not easy to adjust Paul's doctrine of election to his doctrine of the love of God. Paul does not make them harmonious, but he does give love the first place in the nature of God, and the final place in his purposes; he does look at the foreordaining and determining will of God as having chiefly the ends of love in mind, and the ends of universality (Romans 8:28–30; 11:32).

It is not from Paul's Hebraic biblical theology on the whole that we can get light on our present problems. Arguments such as those in Romans 4; 5:12–21; 9–11, have for us chiefly an historical interest. Theology has used them more than their nature justifies. But the bold and revolutionary judgments which this theology was framed to defend, "Christ is the end of the law," and "there is no distinction between Jew and Greek," call forth our wonder and unstinted admiration, and our unreserved consent. They are most impressive evidence of the fact that Paul, having seen Jesus in the beauty and excellence of his nature, and having seen the glory of God in his face, was able to draw from that vision with insight and courage these inferences, which reversed the convictions of all his past zealous and devoted religious thinking and life, and had incalculable influence on the spiritual history of Europe and of the world.

It may illuminate the distinction between what Paul knows, and his theological arguments about it, if we add one more illustration, namely, his treatment of life after death. What most impresses one who reads with care the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians is the confidence and enthusiasm of Paul's conviction that death cannot separate the Christian from Christ, or from God. But we can certainly distinguish here, as in the other cases, between the real reasons for Paul's Christian confidence and the argument in explanation and demonstration of it which he elaborates. Life after death is decidedly a matter about which it concerns us to know the faith of such a man as Paul. Outward authoritative revelation does not appeal to us; nor do we find the arguments for and against it by even the greatest minds convincing, certainly not creative of the exultant spirit of Paul's hope. We ask those who profess to speak with authority, and those also who seek to convince by reasoning, How do you know? And that question we ask of Paul also. Is this one of the matters about which Paul knows more than we do, or knows better than we do what is the truth and the fact? In his case we apply, here as before, his own tests, and by means of them we can but try to distinguish in what he writes between what he knows and what he thinks, between his knowing the eternal life and his thinking about it.

Here again it seems right to say that what Paul knew was due to Jesus himself. Paul knew Jesus, and Jesus was the real reason for his new Christian assurance of life in the world to come. His real reason was not even his vision of the heavenly Christ, although he sometimes speaks as though that were the ultimate ground; but rather that which made the vision itself possible and convincing, namely, the nature of Jesus as manifesting and demonstrating the love of God. Nothing that Paul says in his letters is more creative of faith and hope than his exclamation, Nothing, not death itself, can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. No doubt Paul would say that the vision convinced him that Christ's life after death was a fact, and even showed him what sort of a fact it was, in what body Christ lived. But his vision was primarily the opening of his eyes to the divineness of the humility and self-sacrificing love of Christ. The ground of all was Christ himself; and the help that Paul gives to our faith in life after death is not his vision, it is Christ in him, it is Paul himself in Christ. Paul is himself a convincing proof, and one of the greatest, that the life of Christ can become the life of men, that the love of Christ can constrain men and become in them a love like Christ's, so that the old self dies, and the new Christ-self lives in men.

The most characteristic and the greatest things that Paul says about the Christian hope in life after death are said in close connection with that which was to him a fact of his present inner experience, the fact which he expressed by saying that the one who is Christ's has already died with Christ and risen with him to newness of life. Because Christ died and rose, he also dies and rises, and now lives no longer to himself. The death of the old self and the life of the new man in Christ's image were to Paul the present facts of experience which involved—bringing with them as if the two were parts of one thing—the outward rising with Christ after bodily death, and the literal living with Christ, with a nature therefore like his, a body spiritual, angelic, as is his. In Romans 6:1–11 it is not easy to draw a sharp line between the present new life following the crucifixion of the body of sin, and that living with Christ which is still future. In Romans 8:23–25 the redemption of the body is still a matter of hope, but is already experienced in its beginnings because of the spirit. The "dying of Jesus" which Paul now bears about in his person, that he may make evident the life of Jesus in his own earthly life, is not only a dying of selfishness, but a dying of the outward man, and the renewal of the inward; and with this the transition is without break to the immortal life, at home with the Lord, of which the spirit is the present pledge, because in some sense the beginning (II Cor. 4:16–5:10). The unselfish life, because "more needful for your sake," has the first right, but to die would be gain (Phil. 1:21–26); and the resurrection from the dead, to which Paul is still pressing on, seems to be both the present gaining of Christ and the future life with him (Phil. 3:8–14, 20–21). It is passages like these that let us more deeply into the reality of Paul's hope and the way in which it is grounded in his present experience, and so belongs to that which he knows through knowing Christ, than do the details of I Thess. 4:13–17 and even of I Cor. 15. It is true that in this great chapter the traditional conceptions which Paul made use of, and the logical processes of his argumentation, are lifted up by emotion, and become not information such as can best be stated in prose, but spiritual vision, given with increasing passion and culminating in a fully poetic, inspiring expression of religious faith and hope. Paul's belief in life after death has the fact of Jesus beneath it as its foundation, and the fact of Christ within, which makes it essentially, and as far as that is possible, a matter of present experience. That is, Paul's hope is a part of his knowledge of Christ in history and in the mind of the Christian.*

In regard then to the Christian thinking of Paul, our conclusions are that we must apply his own tests to it, that in all its greater parts it has the nature of religious confession, that nowhere does the speculative or philosophical interest appear, and that where theology does show itself it is in the form of Hebrew interpretations of the Old Testament and arguments based upon them. These arguments concerning Adam, Abraham, the calling and destiny of Israel, Moses and the Law, belong to Paul's time, and have little light, if any, to cast upon the problems of our own.

---

*I may refer, for fuller discussion, to my chapter on "Paul's Belief in Life After Death," in *Religion and the Future Life,* edited by E. H. Sneath; and to my article on "The Place of Apocalyptical Conceptions in the Thought of Paul," in *The Journal of Biblical Literature,* 1922; pp. 183–204.

It is about the meaning of the love of Christ, and what it is natural for one who is constrained by that love to think about God, and man, and the world, that we can learn and should never cease learning from the thinking of Paul, and from Paul himself.

IV

CHRISTIAN THINKING ABOUT CHRIST

IV

CHRISTIAN THINKING ABOUT CHRIST

I. PRINCIPLES AND TESTS

We have found that Paul's Christian thinking about God, man, and the world, is determined by the two facts, Jesus in history, and Jesus in the mind of the Christian, and proceeds, therefore, upon two principles, and appeals to two proofs and tests, namely, that it be according to Jesus himself and his way of thinking, and that it be according to the Christian, natural to one in whom Christ lives, one who is of the same mind that was in him. Now we have to ask in what sense and with what results these two principles apply to Paul's thinking about Christ himself, and what we can learn from Paul on this central problem of our own Christian thinking.

But there is a preliminary question, which, strange though it may sound, does naturally suggest itself to one who is trying to learn from Paul what the Christian religion really is. The two tests themselves suggest the question. Is not Jesus Christ the one fact in history and in experience which the Christian knows? Is it not precisely the characteristic of Christian thinking, as Paul conceives it, that it is thinking about other things in the light of that fact? The Christian thinks about other things, because, since they are things, not persons, he cannot know them directly and see them as they are in themselves; but Christ he knows with an inward immediate and certain knowledge, because Christ is that which in the most real sense the Christian himself is, and he knows him as he knows himself. Is there not then, according to Paul, a fallacy in the very idea that Christ is one about whom the Christian has to think? The Christian is one who knows Christ in his own nature as love, love in its purity and fulness, the love of God. That is personal knowledge in its essential distinction from other knowledge. When we know other persons as we know ourselves, that is, when we love them as we love ourselves, we have what even scientists are recognizing as the only knowledge of things in themselves that is within our reach. Our knowledge of other things, not ourselves, and not becoming ourselves as some other persons do by mutual love, is only a knowledge of symbols, of abstractions. It is knowing only certain limited and strictly defined things about them: it is not knowing the things themselves. There are indeed persons whom we know as we know other things. We know about them, but we do not know them. There are those who know Jesus only as one apart and objective, that is as a thing rather than as a person. To them questions about him are important, because knowledge about him is the only knowledge they are seeking. Paul certainly did not think about Jesus in this way. He was not so much interested in things about Jesus as we should expect him to be and often wish that he had been. But Paul knew Jesus, the fact of Jesus in history and what manner of man he was, one in whose face we see the glory of God, which is love. Even the word love, though it is the best single word for that which Jesus was, Paul would have us understand and interpret by Jesus, rather than interpret him by it. It is Jesus himself, not even love, who is the primary and fundamental fact of Paul's Christianity. About the fact of Jesus in history Paul has reassured us. It did not seem to him to be a fact about which questions could be asked. He was too close to the earthly life of Jesus to imagine that any one could raise historical doubts about his reality or about his personal nature, his mind and will. Paul's world was full of living eye-witnesses. Those who are impressed by what seems to them Paul's slight knowledge of Jesus and his little care for such knowledge, face a difficult problem in the evident intensity and passion of Paul's love for Jesus. How could he know him so little and love him so much?

But Paul also knew Jesus in his own inner self. He bears immediate witness to the experience through which Jesus becomes the new nature of men, and lives again in them. When Christ is thus the life of men, is being formed within them, when looking at the face of Jesus they are transformed into the same image, how then should they ask questions about his nature, and seek to discover and define his place in the world of things? They know him for themselves because they know him in themselves. It is so that Christ lives on; and every Christian's knowledge of him should be his own, a knowledge of the kind that is most inward and intimate and at first hand, most truly the knowledge of reality.

Christian thinking then is not thinking about Christ, but thinking about other persons and things in the light of the knowledge of Christ. It is thinking with Christ and according to Christ. This is the way, as we have already seen, in which Paul makes the great transition from Jesus in history to Jesus in the mind of the Christian, and does so without losing the identity of these two with each other. So Christ remains on earth after his departure from it. Love cannot remain as an impersonal abstraction, or even as a personified ideal, or as any kind of substantial energy, however refined and ethereal, but only as loving persons, as persons loving one another. Christian thinking is the thinking of one who is constrained by the love of Christ, but has no other constraint; it is the free and natural thinking of one in whom lives the Spirit of Christ.

To say such things, Paul would no doubt agree, is, indeed, to say the greatest things of Christ that can be said; but it is not what we naturally think of as Christology. In place of a Christology Paul gives men himself: "Be ye imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ." Just as Paul does not think of the Jesus of history as a doubtful fact, needing proof of its reality, or critical research for its recovery, so also he does not think of his experience that Christ lives in him as a mystery that must be understood by comparing it with other mental facts, or with the mysteries of other religions. Christ was not to Paul a problem which needed something else for its solution: he was the solution of problems. He was not a darkness which needed to be dispelled by some other light: he was himself the light of the knowledge of God. The knowledge of Christ is indeed a knowledge in which Christians should grow; but the growth is not by intellectual achievements. It is the *love* of Christ which the Christian should increasingly know. Whatever mystery there is in Christ is to Paul the mystery of love; and love recognizes no intellectual explanation as necessary or as possible, however great and divine the wonder of it may be. Love itself alone, that is the person who loves, is sufficient. The mystery of Christ is personal, spiritual; it is not in any sense, however refined, physical; it is not objective, not measurable, and therefore not a matter for scientific research. The sort of effort that growth in the knowledge of Christ involves is described by Paul in the language of lofty and intense feeling and aspiration; and that is the only kind of language in which it can be expressed (Phil. 3:8 ff.; Eph. 3:14–19).

Paul then would not seem to need a Christology, an explanation of the problem of Jesus Christ, but only an explanation according to Christ of all other things. The order of the Christian experience would be, first, the knowledge of the fact of Jesus in history; then the recognition, the vision, of the divine beauty and exceeding excellence of his nature; then the experience of him, so known, so wondered at and worshipped, as the power within us that changes our natures toward likeness to his own, working with us as we work with him toward that lofty and distant goal; and finally a theology, a thinking and teaching about God, about man, about the world, as they appear to one who has this experience and is engaged in this endeavor; a theology, an anthropology, a cosmology, though the ponderous Greek words are little fitted to express the newness of all things as we see them in the light of Christ. It is not things, nor the science or philosophy of things, that one sees as new in the light of Christ. It is the eye of love to which all things seem new, which finds new beauties, new things that are to be loved, and effects transformations of things unlovely into things which can be loved. This Christian experience proceeds throughout from Christ and centres in him; yet a Christology hardly seems to have a place in it.

Now in all this I think that we are truly learning from

Paul. We are on the right path toward understanding him when we say that on the whole his tendency, his prevailing purpose, was to treat Jesus Christ not as one who needs to be explained, but as one in whom is the explanation of all the problems of religious faith and life. But is it correct to say that he fashioned no Christology? Many Christologies have been derived from him, or at least have appealed to him and made use of his language. That they are so many and so different is indeed a significant fact. If Paul's Christianity had consisted in a Christology, and if he thought that one became Christian by assenting to some doctrine of the person and work of Christ, then we should certainly expect to find that he chose one of the various doctrines that were already taking shape in early Christian circles, or developed a definite doctrine of his own; and that he expressed it with unmistakable clearness and consistency and defended it by cogent arguments. In reality it appears that Paul was much more concerned that Christians hold whatever theories they pleased about Christ and his work in a spirit of unity, with respect for each other's opinions, and an avoidance of controversy, than that the theories themselves should be true, or should be in accordance with his own. It is true that Paul has been a source much drawn upon in the making of Christologies, and that in fact he says many things about Christ which can be put to such a use. That Paul fashioned and taught a high Christology, in which a doctrine of the divinity of Christ was practically substituted for the reality of the human Jesus, is the conviction of many who chiefly for that reason value Paul and magnify the greatness of his achievement; and also of many who for the same reason reject and condemn him as the one who put a religion about Jesus in the place of the religion of Jesus as the sum and substance of Christianity. What then was the nature of such thinking about Christ as we find in his letters?

Let us approach our answer by looking, first, at the two principles of his thinking, in order to ask again the question with which we began, in what sense and with what results these principles apply to Paul's thinking when Christ is its object. How did he apply to his thinking about Jesus the tests that Christian thinking should be according to Jesus, and that it should be according to the Christian?

To think about Jesus according to Jesus himself would mean at least that one's thinking should begin with Jesus and always be controlled and determined by him. Self-evident though this may seem, it does certainly need to be emphasized. Jesus himself must give contents and significance to whatever terms are used in the effort to describe and explain his nature and his calling. Whatever is said of Jesus must be true of Jesus as he really was. Whatever titles are applied to him must be interpreted by him. He must define them; they must not be allowed to define and explain him. This natural inference from the first principle of Paul's Christian thinking Paul himself would certainly consent to, and did, I believe, intend. In all his thoughts about Christ he meant to hold unchangeably to Jesus himself.

That by which we seek to explain anything that is strange and great may easily seem to be greater than that which it explains. Every Christology threatens to make something else more certain, better known, and even of greater value than Jesus himself, even though its first aim was to exalt him. This danger was present from the very beginning. The first of all Christologies was the interpretation of Jesus as the Messiah, the Christ, and the danger of all Christologies appeared at once in this one which led the way. If Paul's first test of Christian thinking is valid, then when Jesus was called Messiah that title should have been interpreted in accordance with his actual character and work. The Christian should have been one who held that Messiah did not mean the King of Israel, the conqueror of Rome, the one destined to rule and judge all nations in Rome's place, but that Messiah meant that which Jesus actually was, and the Messiah's reign that which Jesus actually did. The Christian's confession should have been, not Jesus is the Messiah, but the Messiah is Jesus. "Jesus is Messiah" would inevitably involve the inference that since Jesus was not in fact Messiah in his earthly life, he became Messiah after his death, or would come as Messiah in the near future. So Jesus was displaced by the title which was meant to honor him. He was dethroned, and another, the creation of Jewish national hopes, reigned in his place. Messiahship carried its own qualities and functions with it, and imposed them upon Jesus, or demanded that he fulfil them, even though it involved his coming again to do what he had failed to do, what indeed he had refused to do, when he was on earth. The very first Christology, therefore, and the one which gave its name not only to all Christologies but to Christianity, reveals strikingly the danger lest, in the effort to interpret and explain Jesus, something different from Jesus, and that can only mean something less than he, be put in his place. The Book of Revelation is evidence of the difficulty of giving to Jesus the central place in the apocalyptic hopes shaped originally by Judaism without the danger of substituting for Jesus himself a figure very different from him. This book is put forth as Jesus' own revelation of his nature and his future deeds, but Jesus himself is hard to recognize in the words and deeds that are here attributed to him.

A king of Israel of David's line and kind would make no appeal to the Greek world in which Christianity began at once to make itself at home, in which its greatest victories were to be achieved. So it happened by a process that we cannot retrace that the title, Christ, early lost its original meaning and became only a part of the proper name of Jesus. Even to Paul, as still to us, the name Jesus Christ means simply Jesus himself and carries with it no Israelitish and political suggestions. That name signifies that Jesus very early subdued the word Christ to himself. He gave and still gives to the word its meaning, and the first and great danger that it would displace him was in large measure overcome.

But the danger immediately returned as Greek Christians applied other titles to Jesus in the same effort to explain his nature and place. The names, Lord, Son of God, Son of Man, Wisdom of God, the Logos, brought their various meanings with them out of their Hebrew or Greek past, and tended to transform Jesus into their likeness, rather than to subject themselves wholly to him, and to accept him as their new meaning and real fulfilment. If Paul applied the first test of Christian thinking, that it be according to Jesus, to his own thinking about Jesus himself, then it must have been his purpose to make Jesus the interpreter of whatever terms might be applied to him. That this was in reality his intention, and that it was the prevailing tendency of his thinking, is one conclusion to which our following discussion leads. Jesus was not to Paul the problem, but its solution. Nothing else was more certainly real, or more certainly known, than he, and nothing else could be compared with him in greatness and value. That such conceptions should have been applied to Jesus was inevitable, but that they should all be subjected to him was essential if they were to become really Christian, and if Jesus was to be affirmed and not denied by them. This would seem to be the natural result of Paul's applying the first principle of his Christian thinking to Christ himself.

But what shall we say of the second of the principles of Paul's Christian thinking, that it be according to the Christian, and of its application to Christian thinking about Christ? Christologies seem to have been meant from the beginning to define and explain the peculiarity of Christ, that which separates him from all other men, to prove and to interpret the unique union in him alone of divine and human qualities, of God and man. But if Christologies are meant to define the difference that separates Christ from other men, then how could Paul have applied to his thinking about Christ the test that it be according to the Christian? Could he have meant that the Christian is to look within as well as into the past in order to find and know Christ? Strange as it may seem I believe that this was exactly what Paul did intend. We have already found that Paul carries very far his conviction that the Christian is at one with Christ, that the new self of the Christian is indeed Christ himself. The Christ with whom his thinking is concerned is no doubt the Christ within as well as the Christ of past history. It would therefore not be so strange if we should find that Paul believes that one must first know Christ in that inward, personal sense in which Paul uses the word know; and that the Christ of whom he thinks can be only the Christ whom he thus already knows. Christian thinking about Christ would therefore be the thinking natural to one who is "in Christ."

The Christian's natural attitude of mind and feeling and will toward Christ has two sides. It is an attitude of wonder and worship toward one greater than one's self, and it is an attitude of communion, of a oneness in love and trust which becomes nothing less than a oneness in nature. The union of reverence toward one far above and of love toward one so near as to be, as it were, one's new self is the greatness and distinction of Christianity as Paul knows it. The union of these two is perhaps exactly that mystery, that problem, with which Christian thinking should most concern itself. It is peculiarly a problem on which we may look to Paul for light. Paul's explanation of this union of apparent opposites is to be found in the nature of Christ, that is in the nature of love. If the love of Christ is the love of God, then since love can be known only as love, received by us only as it becomes love in us, and since love must give its best, and that best is nothing but love itself, it follows of necessity that the Christian experience passes from wonder to transport, from worship to oneness, and that these two remain inseparable parts of the Christian's one experience of Christ. Paul is above all others the apostle and interpreter of this mystery. Indeed the two tests of his Christian thinking simply put side by side the two elements that are united in his experience. "According to

Christ" means the recognition of his greatness, his right that every thought of ours be brought into captivity to him; and "according to the Christian" means that the same Jesus Christ who is above us is within us, that we have his nature as our own and can understand him by understanding ourselves as he has re-created us after his image. The second test, when applied to our thinking about Christ, would mean that we are to affirm about him nothing which we cannot in some real sense experience as our own because of our oneness with him. To Paul the Christian is "in Christ," Christ is in him, in such a sense that all that is true of Christ has its truth also in the Christian. No doctrine of the person of Christ is Pauline that does not leave possible and even make natural and inevitable the oneness of the Christian with Christ. Christ's nature is such, being love, that he wills to share that nature with others. Love cannot be itself without imparting itself to all who will receive it. Nothing, therefore, can be truly thought about Jesus which so separates him from men that such sharing is not possible. He is indeed in Paul's faith above, one to be worshipped; but he is also within, creating in us his own likeness. Christ is indeed unique, yet not in such a sense that he cannot be the real self of every Christian. Our creeds have found it easier to state and to explain the uniqueness. The creeds seem to avoid saying of Christ anything that can in any conceivable sense be said of the Christian. Yet this can only mean that the creeds are not Pauline. Somehow to Paul the divineness of Jesus did not mean his uniqueness; or one may prefer to say, the uniqueness of Jesus is not such as to separate him from us. "Somehow," we say, yet Paul does not leave us wondering how and why.

We have only to see that in the light of Jesus divineness has the character of love, in order to know that such divineness cannot remain unique, and that there can be no discipleship of Christ that does not mean Christlikeness.

This of course did not mean to Paul that there is nothing distinctive in the place of Jesus in the Plan of God. But Jesus is not unique in the fact that he has a place of his own in God's purpose for mankind. Every man has his place and significance in the thought of God, and it belongs to God's nature as love that a high place does not separate one from those who have lowly places. The conception that Christ has the highest place of all does not constitute a distinction that separates him in nature from us. Paul himself had a vivid sense of his own peculiar place and of its importance (Gal. 1:15–16, Eph. 3:2–13, Col. 1:24–29). He felt the greatness and responsibility which his calling put upon him; but he did not feel that it could cause pride or ambition, or could in any way stand in the way of love. His calling had the unity of mankind as its aim, as did the calling of Jesus; and every Christian's calling has the same purpose. If Paul has a Christology it would seem to consist in his definition of the place of Christ in the work of the love of God toward men. When Paul defines that special task we should expect him to say things of Christ that he would not say of others. Yet the calling and work of Jesus and the special acts of God in and through him were the revelation and ministry of love, and as such have a universal quality.

If Paul had wanted to separate Christ from men by his use of the Hebrew conception of a purpose of God and of great acts of God in time, we should certainly expect to find that he divided his picture of Christ so as to distinguish the features that men can and should imitate from those that belong to his peculiar calling. But, strange as it seems, that is just what he will not do. He does not simply hold up the humility and love, the forbearance and gentleness of Jesus as that which should characterize the Christian also, but he chooses often his most distinctive experiences, those that seem peculiarly to belong to his special calling, his death and resurrection, even his heavenly life, even his kingship and his coming, as having their application to all Christians. These are to be shared by all who are in Christ; and to know Christ means peculiarly to know the fellowship of his sufferings, to be conformed to his death, to attain to his resurrection. Paul seems more concerned to interpret the death and resurrection of Christ in a sense in which the Christian can and must make them his own, than to set them forth as peculiar works of God done once for all in Christ. But he did not regard either of these two so different interpretations of the death and resurrection of Christ as excluding or limiting the other, nor does he seem to feel any necessity of explaining their relation to each other. As in the case of his uniting reverence toward the Christ above him and oneness with the Christ within, so also here we are facing what is to us a fundamental problem in Paul's thinking about Christ; and the problem seems greater to us because it seems to have been no problem to Paul. We are certainly not understanding Paul in either case if we choose one of the two seeming alternatives as Paul's meaning and set the other aside. The only fair way is to interpret each in the light of the other, assuming that if we think of them as Paul did we shall not find them contradictory.

To think as Paul did is to be constrained by the love of

Christ. We come back to this as the secret of everything in Paul's Christianity. The nature of Christ is love; and the love of Christ is the love of God. The love of Christ constrains the Christian and becomes in him the same love. If then love is the nature of Jesus, apartness, superiority, is not what he desires for himself, or can allow. Love is not exalted by being set apart. It cannot tolerate separation. It desires to give all that it has and to share all that it is with all that will receive it. Or, since we may not talk about love as "it," as if it were an abstract entity, whereas it cannot be anything but a quality and activity of persons, we should rather say that one who loves wishes to unite all others with himself and with one another in love. We cannot apply a doctrine of essential and permanent separateness to one whose nature and whose greatness is love. Paul understands this better than most of his successors, and he interprets the destiny and right of Jesus to have dominion over all in accordance with this knowledge. Jesus has within him an energy that is able to subject all things to himself (Phil. 3:21). But when Paul says this he is speaking of the power by which Jesus will hereafter transform our lowly and mortal bodies into likeness to his own heavenly nature. He subjects all things to himself by transforming all into likeness to himself in spirit and even in outward form. Paul is never far from the thought that the greatness of Jesus, his kingship and lordship, consist in his will and his power to impart his own nature to men, re-creating them in his own image and lifting them up to a share in his own glory. It is this conception which gives its naturalness and its meaning to Paul's extraordinary conception that the Christian is to find Christ not only in the past, in Jesus as he was in history, but also within; that he is to think of Christ in accordance with that which he knows in himself to be the presence and work of the spirit of Christ; and since it is the will of Christ, and of God in and through Christ, to impart nothing less than himself to men, it is therefore not an extravagance, not irrational, that Paul's thinking about Christ should be determined by the principle that the Christian will say nothing about Christ which he should not be able to say of himself, that is, nothing of such a nature that he cannot himself experience its truth and know it for himself by knowing himself as Christ has made him to be.

This is in accordance with a characteristic of Paul's Christianity which is almost as important to him as the central place of love, and is indeed inseparable from it, namely, inwardness, or freedom, in contrast to all external authority. Paul had been a zealous disciple of a religion of authority, the religion of the Torah, and had known how to say, "I know," of whatever was written in the law of God revealed to Moses. His Christian experience had brought that conception of religious knowledge to an end. As a Christian he will say, "I know" only of that which belongs to his own inner being, of which the certainty rests upon the reality of his own experience. Having been exceedingly zealous for traditions, he at once became as zealous for absolute freedom. He conferred not with flesh and blood, not even with those who were apostles before him. The Christian is one who is divinely taught. He has within himself the spirit of God, the mind of Christ. Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. And that inwardness and freedom Paul does not hold as his peculiar right as an apostle, but assumes that all Christians have experienced it and urges them to hold it fast as their peculiar treasure. "We all, reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory." Christians not only see the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, but in their own faces also other men can see the same light. It is thus that Paul puts Christians, himself and others, in the place of Christologies as the explanation, the proof, the revelation, of the fact and the nature of Christ. It is as if Paul said, If you ask me what I know of Christ, and what I think of him, I can only answer, look at me; what I am Christ has made me, and it is after his own likeness; not that I have attained, nevertheless it is I, it is Christians, who are Christ's writing; and no writings about Christ, no efforts to put his nature into words, are to be compared in value and truth to the living reproductions of it. This puts the same strange requirement that we think and say nothing about Christ of which we cannot experience the truth in ourselves in a somewhat different light; it means not only that we have the right to think of Christ in accordance with that which he is in us, but that we have also the duty, as the ideal of our living and the goal of our achievement, worthily to set forth Christ himself before men.

Paul, of course, does not know the word Christology, but he does think deeply about what it means to know Christ. This is nowhere more clearly and powerfully set forth than in the third chapter of Philippians. No passage could be a better guide in our effort to understand the thinking of Paul about Christ, and no Christology which does not express the total personal attitude of thought, of feeling, and of will, which this passage reveals, no Christology which does not have room for its contents and breathe something of its spirit, can be truly called Pauline.

Paul trusts the knowledge of Jesus which is love, and knows that it is the best knowledge that we can have, our only immediate knowledge of reality. He would have others trust that way of knowledge and pursue it with complete devotion toward its end, which is a real communion, the oneness of the Christian with Christ. It is a knowledge of Christ which we must believe is ours, given us by Christ himself, and must live according to that belief; and we must also know that it is above us and beyond us, and must strive after it, leaving all else behind. Paul has both of these attitudes toward the knowing of Christ, and does not feel them to be in any way contradictory. Neither of them has any resemblance to that knowing about Christ with which creeds and theologies have been largely concerned, nor to that very different knowing about Christ to which historical students must devote themselves. Whatever may be the intellectual necessity and value of these two kinds of thinking about Christ, neither of them is that which Paul means by knowing Christ.

If Paul would say nothing about Christ that has not reality and truth in the Christian's own experience, that means that he could say nothing that radically and finally separated Christ from men. That which distinguishes him will still not be something that separates him. Christ was indeed far above Paul's actual achievement, but he was not apart from Paul's real nature, for that would have meant that he could not be imitated, or even loved, or even known. To set Christ apart in that sense is to contradict the Christianity of Paul, to strike at its very heart. It has been a strange delusion, has it not?—one shrinks from the presumption such a charge seems to involve—yet if Paul's Christianity is really Christian, has it not been a strange assumption, though it has so easily prevailed from the beginning until now, that one cannot think of Christ as in any real sense like the Christian? The Christian should indeed be like Christ, but it seems dangerous to suppose that Christ is to be found in Christians, so that he can be really understood and defined by what we see in Christians and know in ourselves. This, we are often assured, is to lower Christ to the level of men. The Christian's thought about Christ must be first and always that he is not like us. But is not this to think of Christ in physical rather than in spiritual terms? If love is the reality according to which the relation between Christ and God, and also between Christ and men, is to be defined and experienced, then our unlikeness to Christ can only be our failure; our likeness to Christ will be that which Christ himself desires; and the greatness of Christ is the characteristic greatness of love, the power to break down barriers and create oneness.

Paul's thinking about Christ could certainly not have had the purpose of proving and explaining what separates Christ from men. To know Christ as different from ourselves, in the sense in which creeds and dogmas have on the whole defined the difference, is not really to know him at all. We are really knowing Christ when we know that which we have in common with him. To attempt to know what separates him from us can only leave us wandering in regions in which knowledge is to us impossible. Moreover, if we are learning from Paul, we must see that these outside, unhuman regions, into which experience cannot enter, which only speculation can seek to explore, are not unknowable because they are higher and more divine than the highest that our spirits can attain. What we are looking for in these dark regions is not the person Jesus Christ; for the region of personality is the one in which we are at home, being persons ourselves. These wanderings in search for a sort of reality different from the personal and higher than it, really take place in an imagined higher material and sensible realm of being. This thing that is to be completely other and greater than ourselves, by which we should like to interpret Jesus and so set him fully apart from us men as one whom we can worship but cannot approach, is after all a thing, some fancied ultimate refinement of a material thing; and a thing, however ethereal and refined, however vast like space and enduring like time, is not only, like all other things, beyond our real knowledge, but is less, not more, than personal; less, not greater, than love.

The question may here be asked whether the two principles, that we are to think about Jesus according to Jesus himself, and that we are to think about him according to the Christian, involve the effort to think about Jesus as he thought about himself. The question involves us in historical difficulties that are very great. Only the fourth gospel attempts to tell us in detail what Jesus said about himself; and this is a distinction of this gospel from the other three which raises serious doubts about its character as a historical record. The problem of the self-consciousness of Jesus is one about which we can hardly hope that agreement will ever be reached. If it is impossible to answer it by looking only at the Jesus of history, since the gospels leave us in great uncertainty about it, the question may conceivably be raised whether any light can be cast upon it by the second approach to a knowledge of Christ which we have been considering. If the Christ of the Christian's new inner self is, in any such sense as that of Paul's conviction, Christ himself, that is, if the Christian is in so real a sense an effect of Christ that in him the real nature of Christ is reflected, then it would seem that we might make a certain approach to this problem by asking what self-consciousness is natural to one who has the mind of Christ, and what was natural to Paul himself. Paul, as we have seen, was keenly alive and delicately sensitive to the difficulty of the task which the Christian experience puts upon the Christian's thoughts about himself; the difficulty that humility has in remaining humble, and that love has in mastering self-love, when the divineness, the beauty and the power of humility and of love are realized. Paul would have his consciousness of self completely subjected to a genuine humility and love after the likeness of Jesus himself. Paul had a much closer and, no doubt, a far more vivid and true conception of the place of the self in the mind of Jesus than is possible for us. He certainly had a deep sense of the wonder and divine power of the gentleness and lowliness of Jesus, and of what the self was, the self that is found through the losing of self, in the case of the one whose love led him to entire self-denial and to the cross. The self-consciousness of Paul himself, not only what it was, but what Paul was anxious that it should be, must surely throw real light on what he believed the self-consciousness of Jesus to have been.

But whether of Paul or of Jesus our own understanding of their thought of self will be conditioned by what we see when we look within. In the measure in which we have in ourselves the humility and love of Christ and are striving to realize what it means to find our self by losing it, to become first by being last of all, our insight will be truer into the self-consciousness of Jesus. Even with regard to so deeply personal a matter as Jesus' thought about himself it remains true that one person can know another only in the measure of his inner sympathy and likeness. Surely in the understanding of the meaning and worth of humility, of the greatness of that lowly word, of the meaning of self-denial, the nature and power of love, Jesus was the supreme master; but surely he was still one whose teachings can be understood by us only if we are in some measure of his mind. If the self-consciousness of Jesus was unique in such a sense that it could not in the nature of things be shared by any one else, if he was not only the Son but the only Son of God, or if in any other naming or description his nature was essentially unhuman, then the understanding of it is wholly out of our reach. If, on the other hand, the self-consciousness of Jesus is bound up with the nature of his love and his lowliness of mind, then we can in our own measure, and increasingly if we are able to grow in the knowledge of Christ, understand his thoughts about himself.

The problems about Jesus which have nothing to do with the nature of love are problems of which the solution has nothing to do with the Christian experience. They are problems which can be dealt with as well by those who are not Christians as by those who are, or by Christians in their capacity as historians or psychologists independently of their character and their knowledge as disciples. The problems about Jesus that are in any way involved in the nature of love are those for the solution of which we can be competent only in the measure in which we are constrained by the same love which was in Christ, only as we have learned or are learning to love as he loved. These, I believe, are thoughts of Paul, or are involved in Paul's way of thinking about Christ. They are involved in the two decisive marks of Christian thinking according to Paul, that it be according to Jesus himself, and that it be according to the Christian, natural to one who has the mind of Christ.

Two inferences may be drawn from these two tests which may further help us in deciding what is Pauline and what is Paul's meaning in the language about Christ which his letters contain. It is to be observed that the first test of Christian thinking, when applied to our thinking about Jesus, takes us back to the Jesus of history. The second test takes us back to the resurrection, because with that experience the transition was made from Jesus in history to Jesus in the mind of the Christian. With the resurrection the Christian came into existence, that is, in Paul's terms, the one who is Christ's, is "in Christ," has the spirit of Christ, the one who calls God, "Abba," and Jesus, "Lord." The Christian's thoughts about Christ are thoughts about that which Christ is to the Christian, and what Christ is to the Christian he became with the resurrection. We should not expect Paul, therefore, to put the beginnings of the Christ of the Christian faith and experience, of Christ as he is in the mind of the Christian, earlier in time than that event. We should expect Paul's Christological reflections to rest upon the Jesus of history, and to date from the fundamental Christian experience that followed his death.

The second of the inferences that follow from the two tests is that we should expect the language of Paul about

Christ to be that of emotion, not of critical inquiry and argument. The Christian's experience that Christ is being formed within him, that his old self is dead with the death of Christ, and that he lives as a new being with Christ's life and after his image, is not one that lessens that wonder and reverence before one greater than himself, which is the first Christian response to the fact of Jesus. The wonder becomes only greater as the experience becomes deeper that the glory of God in the face of Christ becomes a like glory in the face of the Christian, that the love of Christ becomes a love like Christ's in men. And the language in which such thoughts about Christ seek to express themselves will be in accordance with the inward and personal nature of the experiences. The language about Christ which is natural to the Christian is the language of wonder, worship, gratitude, trust, aspiration. It is the language of love. No language that does not express and satisfy and deepen his trust in Christ and his love for him would have been natural to Paul, or could have had value to him. And nothing is more characteristic of Paul's words about Jesus than that they are spoken with emotion, they are inspired by intensely personal feelings toward the person Jesus Christ. Wonder and worship, trust and love, naturally express themselves in the language of feeling, the language of poetry, not in that of explanation and definition. Christologies, on the contrary, have arisen, not out of the impulse to give expression to the Christian's worship and love of Christ, but out of some sense of the need to ask and answer various questions about him: Whence did he come? What is his nature? What names best express his office and task? But the very asking of such questions may be evidence that the trust and love are not entire and secure. Men are looking about for proof that Christ is one to whom they are justified in committing themselves with so complete a sacrifice of self as he requires. Doubts are arising, or men feel that they must erect defenses against the doubts of others; or an intellectual curiosity is displacing the personal devotion with which the Christian experience began and in which it consists. Such questions involve a certain separation from Jesus himself; indeed they are often asked for the sake of defining that which separates Christ from us and making the separation greater, even making the separation itself a dogma, and assent to it the essence of Christian faith.

A parable may help us to recognize what seems the strange fate of the effort to exalt Christ and to justify faith in him by theories of his origin and nature. In Wagner's interpretation of the legend of Lohengrin, Elsa is warned by her divine-human deliverer and lover not to ask whence he came, what his name, and what his nature. When she was compelled by an impulse which she could not resist to ask the questions, that was proof that she did not fully trust her inner experience and the knowledge which is love. She felt that she must not only know him but also know about him, so as to be sure that her love was deserved and would endure. He could not but answer her questions, and having answered them he could not escape the inevitable consequence of separation from her.

The three questions are the very same that Christians, who were Christians because they had been drawn by the vision of the goodness and beauty and truth of Jesus, were impelled to ask about him whom they inwardly knew and loved. That they must ask the questions meant that their love was something less than perfect. They must know him by some other way than that of immediate personal nearness and communion. They could not trust the love itself which the vision of him and the experience of joy, freedom and moral strength had brought them. It meant a further lessening of love, because matters really external to Jesus tended to displace Jesus himself. It meant not only a certain separation from Jesus, but separations also among his disciples, since it was Jesus himself that united them, whereas about theories of his origin and nature and the name that truly designated his place and authority it was not possible that different minds would agree.

If one is inclined to protest against so human an analogy and against so hard a judgment, let him read again the earliest creeds, which proceed from the virgin birth of Jesus to his death, and have, between these two, nothing. Jesus himself is omitted from the Christian confession of faith in him. The questions, whence he came, and what his nature, and what his name, are answered, but the very asking of these questions has somehow separated him from men. Love and trust are not what the creeds express. Jesus himself is as absent from these early creeds, and from many later ones, as he is from some of the efforts of present-day historians to answer in their very different way the same questions of the origin and the nature, if not indeed of Jesus himself, yet of the Jesus of the gospels, the Jesus of Paul and of John. Whence came this Christ of early Christian faith? What was his nature? By what names was he characterized? These questions may be studied, and interesting and important results attained by learned research, and yet Jesus himself may be left strangely out of sight. Indeed as the creeds seem actually intended to separate Jesus from us and to substitute for him a heavenly and unhuman being, to be believed in though he cannot be known, so, though in so different a way, historical studies seem sometimes to be pursued as if their purpose were to substitute contemporary religious figures and conceptions for anything personal in Jesus and in our knowledge of him, and for anything great.

If these separations of Christians from each other and from Jesus himself have been the tragic consequences of asking the Christological questions, we may ask with some anxiety whether Paul was in any sense responsible for them. There are many who say that he was chiefly responsible; that just this is what was involved in his way of undertaking the great transition from Jesus in history to Jesus in the mind of the Christian. Jesus in the mind of the Christian meant to Paul, we are told, a dogma about Christ in place of the fact of Jesus. But we have not so learned Paul. Jesus in the mind of the Christian was to Paul Jesus himself, and he would not allow any substitute for him. The Christian's knowledge of Christ was a knowledge of the love of Christ. The language of Paul about Jesus is not the language of doubt and fear, nor that of intellectual curiosity and speculation. It is altogether prevailingly the language of emotion. Jesus himself is not absent from what Paul says about him, nor is Paul's love ever absent when he is writing of Jesus. The intensely personal and emotional attitude of Paul toward Jesus is unmistakable throughout. One must read him with veiled eyes, indeed, if he does not see and feel it everywhere. This nature of Paul's language about Christ, and the spirit that inspires it, remain a challenge, and I should not hesitate to say also a disproof, of the traditional dogmatic use of his words. It is also inconsistent with and contradictory to much modern historical interpretation of Paul, which derives his conception of Christ not from Jesus himself but from contemporary Hebrew or Greek apocalypses, or myths, or philosophies.

The nature of the language which Paul uses about Christ, its character as the language of emotion, of wonder and of love, has the right to affect our understanding of what he really meant. We can even say that it is not the things he says but the way in which he says them that enables us to make our way through what he says to Paul himself, to the Christ within Paul who comes to utterance in Paul's words, to those inmost and most personal realities which have the mysterious power of getting themselves into words and through words into other minds. It is perhaps easy for our prosaic minds to take such words literally and to attempt to put their meaning into doctrinal formulas; but it is really doing violence to their nature, robbing them of their virtue and destroying the spirit of life which is in them. It is because his words have been thus taken and forced upon the minds of succeeding ages that men welcome the freedom from Paul which is involved in the discovery that he belonged to his own time. It is nothing less than tragic that in this way we lose sight of the fact that Paul was himself one of the greatest of all the prophets of freedom, and that there is a freedom with Paul which is worth infinitely more to the human spirit than any such freedom from Paul. The Jesus of Paul was himself the creator of freedom, not the maker of a new yoke. Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. With freedom did Christ set us free, he exclaimed, in protest against the tendency of Christians to fall back into bondage to the traditions and observances of their old religion. Stand fast in your liberty. Do not be again enslaved under a yoke of bondage.

It is more important to be sensitively alive to the way in which Paul says things than to be anxiously concerned with the things he says, and that means just now with the historical understanding of them. To say this, after all, is only saying that after we have exhausted our resources in the discovery of parallels to Paul's conceptions in Jewish apocalypses or books of wisdom, or in Greek mystery cults or popular philosophies, and have defined as fully as we can the various matters about which we can no longer suppose that Paul had any special knowledge of his own, we have still before us the most important matter for which the historian also has his responsibility, the understanding of Paul himself. It is, of course, true that Paul spoke the language of his own time; and there is a way of carrying his words over to the present, outwardly transplanting them from their native soil, which is unreasonable and is made impossible by historical studies of the sources and original meaning of his words. The importance of recognizing that the language of Paul is that of his own place and time is not to be doubted. It is a liberating knowledge which frees us, whether we wish the freedom or regret and fear it, from the conception of the authority and finality of his writings. But there are things which we who accept this modern knowledge ought not to forget. It is not only Paul who was a man of his time; it is true of all men and of ourselves;

since no one can speak any other language than that of his time, or can be understood if he attempts to do so. But great men do not become less great because they are men of their time, and because their time is past. It would be well for us all who are engaged in tracing Paul's language back to its ancient sources, and so explaining it in the sense that is apt to mean explaining its present value away, if we would bear in mind the warning uttered by one whose authority is highly and rightly valued in just this sort of study, Reitzenstein, who in criticising his friend Schweitzer's reduction of Paul to a collection of Jewish apocalyptical ideas, remarks: "The history of religion, if it is to be pursued in a genuinely philological way, must not try to minimize personality, since its highest goal is always precisely the apprehension of personality." "This does not mean that a religious personality will not use the language of his time. The history of religion, like all history of the mind, starts from the personality, and has a double explanation, from itself and from the surrounding world. In it nothing can have effect which has no connection with the past, and nothing is living which is not essentially new." "A religious personality cannot merely borrow. It always creates individually, and a religious idea which conquers the world must in its final meaning be new." We must certainly try to understand the words of Paul as the men of his time would have understood them, but also to understand Paul himself behind and within his words as they did. The men who heard and who read Paul were far more impressed by the difference between him and other men of his time than by his likeness to them. The personality of Paul is what we most need to understand even if we are historians;

and to understand Paul himself it is far more important to recognize that his language is the language of emotion than that it is the language of his time. It is in every sense of more importance and of more value to feel with such a man as the apostle Paul than to think with him. And that is truer of what Paul says about Christ than of anything else that he says, since Christ is the very centre and soul of that remarkable personality which it is the highest goal of our reading of his letters to apprehend.

We may now put together our inferences from the nature of Paul's Christian thinking by naming four characteristics or principles which we should expect to find determining his thoughts about Christ: 1. The fact of Jesus is to Paul fundamental, and his thinking about Jesus would be, therefore, according to Jesus himself. Paul intends to bring all his thoughts into captivity to the obedience of Christ. He would interpret all things by him; he would not interpret him by something else, as if anything else could be more certain or of greater importance than he. 2. He would understand Jesus according to the Christian, thinking nothing about him which has not its truth in the Christian's inner experience. What is true of Christ is true of the Christian in the measure in which the spirit of Christ is in him. Nothing that separates Christ from men by an impassable barrier is true either of Jesus in history, or of Jesus in the mind of the Christian. 3. Involved in these two fundamental principles is the natural inference that what Christ is to the Christian he became because of his earthly life and death and resurrection. We should not expect Paul to make affirmations about the Christ of his Christian faith and experience which reach back before his earthly life. 4. The language in which Paul will express what Christ is to the Christian, certainly that which is most characteristic and original, will be the language of emotion, not that of science or philosophy.

The first two of these tests are of primary significance, but the last two also may help us at certain points in determining what Paul said out of his own impulse, and what he may have quoted from others, or even what others may have inserted in his letters. It should not be supposed that we are applying ideas of our own to Paul and trying to make him conform to them. We are only trying to look at his thoughts about Christ in the light of his thinking in general. We are meaning to apply the mind of Paul, the Christian, to the words of Paul about Christ; and we are really testing our tests by Paul, rather than testing Paul by them.

2. THROUGH WHOM ARE ALL THINGS

Let us turn now to some of the most important things that Paul says about Christ; and let us look first at the Christological sayings which seem most flatly to contradict the four principles or tests that we have just enumerated. These are Paul's affirmations of the pre-existence of Christ, which is sometimes referred to, not happily, as Paul's "higher Christology." It is necessary to approach this matter by an effort toward clearness as to various senses in which the idea of pre-existence was held in Paul's time. There is a sense in which Paul, as a Hebrew, thought of the pre-existence of all men, but particularly of those who have an important place and part in carrying out the divine plan in the history of humanity. To Hebrew thinking, as we have already seen, this plan exists from eternity in the thought and purpose of God, and the great acts by which it is to be carried forward, and the persons who are to have a great part in it, would inevitably be conceived as present from the beginning in the mind of God. It would not be strange that this sort of existence before their earthly appearance should sometimes be so vividly imagined that a certain objectivity was given to it. But to the Hebrew way of thinking, even such actual pre-existence would be essentially a vivid imagination and visualization of what had its real existence in the thought of God. It was not to the Hebrew the existence of a spiritual counterpart, the form or "idea" of the coming material thing, or the "soul" of the future man of flesh and blood. So far as there was an actual pre-existence of a man, it was that of the man himself, and what was to come was not his incorporation in a material body, but his coming out of the unseen world into the seen; his appearance, not his incarnation. His existence before his appearance was more significant for God than for him; it was a way of expressing confidence that he was to come, fundamentally an expression of faith in the prophetic promises of God. It was not un-Hebraic to extend this conception from a few men to all. "Every man's life a plan of God" is still a Hebrew conception. Paul not only thinks of himself as having pre-existed in this sense because of the great work that God sent him to do, but of all Christians as having existed in the eternal purpose of God, not only the Son, but all who were to be sons in his image. And this existence in the foreordaining purpose of God would include the determination of the special talent and task of each in the coming community of believers.

That pre-existence in this sense should be affirmed of Christ was inevitable. Above all others God must have thought of him and planned for him from before the beginning of the world. But this sort of pre-existence of Christ, the Hebrew sort we may call it, does not at all contradict our tests of Paul's thinking; that is, it does not separate a heavenly Christ from the earthly Jesus, as if he were a being not only before him but really different from him. It does not separate him from other men in such a way that we cannot understand what is said of Christ by our own experience of the faith it expresses.

It was a Greek not a Hebrew conception of pre-existence which, in the form in which it was applied to Christ, separated him not only from all other men, whether Christian or not, but also from the man Jesus. The Greek when he thought of pre-existence, as especially Plato and his followers did, thought of an existence in a realm of being apart from and above the world of matter and sense, and superior to it not only in value but in reality. From this realm the souls of men descended into the lower and unnatural life in material bodies, and to this, their native realm, they returned when they escaped the prison or tomb of the body. In that realm there are higher, more "generic," existences than the souls of individual men. Stoic philosophy, which was pantheism, developed the idea of a supreme all-including, all-constituting substance, force, and reason, all in one, of which Logos came to be the proper name. All things are made and ordered and held in existence and in unity by it and in it. The souls of men are in its image, and it was the object of men's religious faith and aspiration. When, therefore, Greek Christians, who had held this Platonic-

Stoic philosophy and religion, wished to express the exaltation of Christ above all other men and above all the powers of the universe, they could not but identify him with this Logos. But this identification gave to his pre-existence a significance wholly different from that of the highest place in the purpose of God, and wholly different also from the literal existence of the souls of other men in the heavenly or spiritual realm. It made Jesus the incarnation in a human being of the creative mind and will of God, the first of created beings and the creator of all the rest, indeed, the ultimate substance and the binding and ordering energy which makes the cosmos and constantly keeps it from falling back into chaos.

To identify Jesus with this Logos would not be in accordance with any of the marks of Christian thinking which we have found characteristic of Paul. It could only by violence be brought into any sort of likeness to the Jesus of history, his character and his work. It could not possibly be applied to other men; and Christians would be no nearer than other men to the possibility of experiencing such a nature as their own. The resurrection could have no significance for the incarnated Logos except as marking its return to its normal nature after the brief episode of its taking upon itself the form of human life. The moment from which the Logos came to be that which it now is in the minds of men is the moment of its creation by God or its emanation from him before the creation of the world. And the language in which this Logos-Christ would be described would surely come more from the mind than from the heart.

What could Paul do with a Logos Christology, Paul, whose Christianity consisted in Jesus himself, in the deeds of God in his sending, in his sonship, in his death and resurrection, and in the oneness of the Christian in all these things with Christ?

There are two passages, and only two, in Paul's letters in which Jesus is described in terms which suggest the Logos of Greek philosophy, though the word itself is not used. They are of very great importance in the history of the origin of this way of defining the divineness of Jesus; but our present concern is with the question, what they signify in regard to Paul's own thinking about Christ. The first passage is the Stoic Christian creed which we have already considered in its bearing upon Paul's thinking about God, I Cor. 8:6: "To us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him." That its phrases are Stoic it cannot be necessary to argue after Norden's discussion, in his *Agnostos Theos,* of "a Stoic Doxology in Paul." Its analogies are in such sayings as that which Marcus Aurelius addressed to Nature: "From thee are all things, in thee all things, unto thee all things." The formula goes back to the early Greek physicists. Norden says that this impressive formula of omnipotence, stamped with Stoic pantheism, became a means of binding together the syncretistic religions of the time, including Christianity. Such phrases are used of God (Romans 11:36, Eph. 4:5–6, Heb. 2:10), and of Christ alone (Col. 1:16–17, Heb. 1:2–3), while only in the passage before us are the prepositions divided, and it is God from whom and Christ through whom are all things.

We have already accepted the view as probable that the creed was part of a quotation by Paul from the letter of the Corinthians to him, and that it does not appear that they had been taught it by him. The great significance of those few words, "through whom all things," in the history of Christian thought is, of course, beyond question. The extraordinary character of its assertion is not to be lessened and made more conceivable as Paul's own by finding its source in what is said about the Wisdom of God in Proverbs or Ecclesiasticus. It is not a Hebrew phrase or conception, and is not found in Jewish writers until the Stoic Logos was united with the Hebrew Wisdom as it is in the Wisdom of Solomon, or almost takes the place of the Old Testament Wisdom as it does in Philo. It is an amazing conception of the nature and office of a man who, only a few years before Paul was writing, had lived, a man among men, and died on the cross. It opens the way to a most significant development of Christological doctrine in the church; for this is the first appearance in extant literature of a Christology of the Logos type, cosmic in range, and metaphysical in implication, which sets Jesus completely apart from humanity. It is a strange first appearance of a teaching so extraordinary. Because it appears first in his letter it is quite commonly held that Paul is the author of this Greek or Greek-Jewish Christology; that Paul is the one in whose mind was born the tremendous conception of fitting Christianity to be the religion of the Greco-Roman world by identifying Jesus with the Logos of Hellenistic philosophy and religion, and so lifting him out of the narrowness of Judaism and the small span of his ministry in the insignificant land of Palestine, and making his place the universe and his time eternity. It is an amazing step whoever first took it; but it is a step that some early Christians were more likely to have taken than others. Those whose religion had been the Logos religion of Philo could perhaps have become Christian only if in some way the place of the Logos in their thought of God and his relation to the world and to men could be filled by Christ.

Apollos could well have been a man whose Judaism was of Philo's kind, or perhaps rather of the sort finely represented by the Wisdom of Solomon in the Apocrypha, in which the Jewish Wisdom has taken on, not yet the name, but the cosmic range and materialistic features and functions of the Stoic Logos. There is in the New Testament a book by an unknown author, the Book of Hebrews, which shows how a Hellenistic Jew might attempt to find Christ in the Old Testament as he had formerly found the Logos there. The Logos Christology of this book (1:2–3) has an entirely different place in the writer's Christianity than our Stoic creed has in Paul. The Christology of Hebrews is ruled throughout by the conception that Christ was from eternity at home in the realm of God and of divine realities. The heavenly high priest after Melchizedek's kind, of whom in the Old Testament records no ancestry is given and no mention of his death, is the symbol of the eternal Christ. If the Book of Wisdom shows us what the Judaism of Apollos may have been, the Book of Hebrews may well suggest to us the nature of his Christianity. It is, as has often been remarked, the sort of book that Apollos might have written. Apollos, therefore, is the sort of man who could well have fashioned the Stoic Christian creed of the Corinthians; so that this Christology which they quote in their letter to Paul could have been one of the distinctions that separated those who claimed to be "of Apollos" from those who called themselves "of Paul."

What we have clearly before us in Paul's writing is the way in which he introduces this amazing creed, and the way in which he deals with it. It is, we have said, a strange first appearance of an idea itself so strange as to seem almost inexplicable, the idea that Jesus, the crucified man of Galilee, was the Reason or Word of God through which the universe was made. Paul is quoting from their letter to him. He has warned them against the danger of their saying, "We know," and has told them that the knowledge that makes men proud is not real knowledge, that the love of God is the only first step for men to take toward the knowledge of God, and that the next step would better be called God's knowing us than our knowing God. Then he repeats their "We know," and goes on to quote from them the contents of that wisdom of which they are so unwisely proud. That which they know proves to be that idols are nothing, that there is no God but one, and no Lord but one, though many are so called; that "to us," the knowing ones, there is one God, and one Lord. Then, after quoting the creed, comes Paul's answer: *"But* not in all is the knowledge"; and the rest of the chapter is an admonition warning them not to use that knowledge of theirs and the liberty it gives them in a way that is contrary to a love such as Christ has for the weakest, and such as the strong should have toward the weak, since to harm others is to sin against Christ.

What impresses one as he reads the creed in its setting is that its extraordinary contents do not seem to interest Paul. He has nothing to say about what the creed affirms, but much to say against the pride of those who possess it and the inconsiderateness with which they assert it and apply it to their conduct. It is as if Paul would say, If you wish to identify Jesus with the Logos through whom the world was made, well and good; you certainly need no other Logos; but be careful that your Logos-Christ has the character of Jesus. He does not have that character to you if you affirm the Logos creed in a spirit of conceit and apply it in ways that are regardless of others and are not constrained by the love of Christ. The love of Christ, a love like Christ's, is Paul's only concern. So in the very passage in which our tests seem not to apply, we find Paul applying them, and doing nothing else. Just when he quotes the creed which affirms the pre-existence of Christ, he has Jesus himself and him only in mind, and what it is in him that the Christian should find in himself. You are saying great things about God and about Christ in your creed, he would say, you are saying more than you know; yet say what you will, if only you remember that it is Jesus about whom you are saying it. Unless you are living in his spirit what you say about him counts for nothing. The reality of Jesus is a spirit of lowliness and love toward God and toward man, and if you violate that spirit then when you say even such stupendously great things about Christ as this, you are really not exalting him, but are sinning against him.

The creed affirms the pre-existence of Christ in the highest conceivable sense, that is, in the sense most completely superhuman. This is a Lord Jesus Christ whom one does not see when he looks back at Jesus himself, nor when he looks within at the Christ who dwells in his own soul. This is one whom we could not possibly aspire to imitate.

Yet about this pre-existent Christ Paul has nothing to say. All he says is that they should think of the nature of Jesus himself, and should be toward all men as he was, and as they would be toward him. The chapter read as a whole, instead of proving that Paul was the originator of the Logos Christology, is, I would venture to say, the most effective and convincing proof that he was not and could not have been its author. He gives us the distinct impression that he fears the Logos creed lest by making Christ unhuman and inimitable it should weaken the Christian's sense of his right and his duty to be like Christ. To be sure he does not deny the truth of the creed; he only reveals the fact that he does not care for it. It is not essential to Christian faith. "Not all have this knowledge." Not all need it. The only thing necessary is that those who do have it and think that they know it shall also be Christian in spirit and life. The creed says things both about God and about Christ that can be doubted without the denial of the Christian religion. There were good Christians who did not have the courage to affirm that there were no gods but one. The creed is of the sort over which people will divide and which may endanger the Christian spirit. One knows God or Christ or his fellow-men in the Christian sense only when he knows them in the fully personal sense.

It is not so certain that Paul was without a certain sympathy with those who hesitated to deny that any gods and lords existed except the one. We have already contrasted this creed with Paul's most characteristic expression of his own faith in God and in Christ, and its significance in regard to whatever other powers there may be in heaven or on earth (Romans 8: 35–39). This is Paul's theology and his

Christology, and it is put in the sort of language that is appropriate to its nature. "The love of Christ" is "the love of God which is in Christ." In that parallelism there is contained the real "higher Christology" of Paul, and a higher than this there cannot be. So that the Christian creed of Paul is not the assertion that no other gods and lords exist, but the conviction, which is a confident faith but not a proud knowledge, that neither earthly evils nor angelic powers are able to separate us from that love. This is Paul, but the creed is not. He does not question the creed, perhaps because Apollos valued it. He does not intend to give any aid whatever to those who are putting him and Apollos into contrast and rivalry. There are differences between them, but it is a case of "each as the Lord gave him" (3:3–5). The important thing is "that no one of you be puffed up for the one against the other" (4:6).

If Paul himself were responsible for the creed we should expect some use of it in the first chapters of the letter. Here Paul treats far more fully than anywhere else the relation of Christ and the gospel to the wisdom of the Greeks. Here he actually calls Christ "the wisdom of God" (1:24); but his meaning is not at all that the creative wisdom or Logos of God became man in Christ. The gospel seems weakness and foolishness to the Greeks, because it is so completely the opposite of the wisdom they are seeking after. Only those who have the mind of Christ can see that he is in reality the power of God and the wisdom of God, and can see also that the wisdom of the world is valueless in man's search for God. Paul gives not the least hint that Greek philosophy and the Christian gospel are really identical, since Christ is in reality the Logos through which all things came to be and in which they consist. It does seem that some one, perhaps Apollos, since Paul compares himself only with him, has led some of the Corinthian Christians to regard the gospel as a philosophy, and to disparage the teaching of Paul because there was in it too little wisdom or "gnosis." Paul's defense contains no adjustment or compromise. His "mystery" is not that Christ is in reality the Logos of the philosophers. Any such adjustment seems excluded by Paul's argument. The one who treats the gospel, the cross of Christ, Christ himself, as the wisdom of God, in contrast to the wisdom of the world, which is "foolishness with God," could not possibly have kept in the back of his mind a Greek Christian philosophy in which the wisdom or Logos through which God created the world was in truth identified with Christ. No such thing is meant by the wisdom which Paul says he imparts to the perfect (2:6–16). The writer of these four chapters, who is most unquestionably Paul himself, could not have been the author of the creed, but could very well have quoted and dealt with it as Paul does in the eighth chapter.

But the Logos Christology appears once again in a later letter of Paul and in fuller form. Paul is writing to the Colossians of the Son, "in whom we have redemption, the remission of sins"; and then come the following words:

"Who is the image of God the unseen;
First born of all creation;
For in him were created all things
In the heavens and upon the earth,
The things seen and the things unseen,
Whether [angelic] thrones or lordships or authorities or potentates;

All things through him and unto him have been created;
And he is before all things,
And all things consist in him" (Col. 1: 15–17).

In these verses the same Stoic Logos doctrine is unmistakable, although here also the word Logos is not used. The expression, "the image of God," Paul elsewhere uses of Christ (II Cor. 4:4); the expansion of "all things" in verse 16 is Hebraic, not Greek; but the great assertions in the passage are purely Greek, and belong to Norden's Stoic doxology, or formula of omnipotence. Here the prepositions are not divided between God and Christ, but are all used of Christ alone. They define his place in the universe. He is the first of all created things, and the one not only through whom, but also unto whom all other things were created, and still further the one in whom they hold together, or have coherence and consistency. To the Christ of these verses our tests of Paul's thinking do not apply. What this divine being does, and what he must be in order to do what he does, have no relation whatever to what Jesus did and was. Still more evident is it, if possible, that what is here said of Christ could not in any way be experienced by the Christian as his own, or discovered or verified through his experience of Christ. Again in what is said of Christ the beginning is not with the resurrection, but is emphatically affirmed to be with or before the creation itself. The language is not that of emotion. It is the nature of the things affirmed that impresses the reader, the amazing identification of Jesus Christ with the central conception with which Hellenistic science and philosophy undertook to explain the universe. The only parallels in the New Testament to what is here said of Christ, beside the Corinthian creed, are Heb. 1:2–3, and John 1:1–5. In both of these writings this Logos Christology stands at the beginning and has an important influence on the books throughout. It is even possible to say that the Fourth Gospel and the Book of Hebrews were both written to make a connection —which they attempt in very different ways—between these two things, which would seem too far apart to be brought together, the historical Jesus, and the ultimate entity, whether substance or thought, through which God made and maintains the world. But in Paul's letter to the Colossians the Logos verses stand in the strangest isolation. With the Stoic Christian creed of the Corinthians Paul deals in what precedes and follows his citation of it, though he deals rather with the spirit in which it is held and used than with the meaning or truth of its affirmations. But the Logos verses in Colossians do not begin the book, as if they contained the key to the understanding of its contents, and nothing prepares us for them when they appear, nor are their extraordinary statements explained in what follows, or alluded to anywhere else in the letter. If these three verses were not here they would never have been missed.

It is true that the verses that immediately follow (18–21) do have an unmistakable relationship to verses 15–17, but the significance of that relationship is not at first evident. It appears to consist in a certain parallelism in form with a contrast which seems really a contradiction in contents. It is possible to say, as Dibelius says in his commentary, that Paul first gives his conception of the relation of Christ to the cosmos as the one through whom it was created and sustained, and then in a similar form sums up his soteriological significance. It was evidently Paul's purpose, says this commentator, to show the parallelism between creation and redemption; and Paul here puts the two parts together, giving a larger and more systematic discussion of his Christology than anywhere else in his letters. We shall come back to the question whether this is the right way in which to explain the relationship between these two sections and their two Christologies. For the present it is enough to say that it is the second and not the first of them which the rest of the letter throughout assumes and develops. Apart from the three Logos verses Paul is dealing with Christ's place in the church, not in the universe; with his making peace, not with his making all things.

We notice at once, also, that it is the second of these Christologies which agrees with the four tests of his thinking as completely as the first of them contradicts them all. In what precedes and follows Paul thinks of Christ according to Jesus. His is the spirit that makes peace and unity between all beings which are at enmity with God and with one another. In no other letter is Paul bolder in uniting the Christian with Christ. Paul's own sufferings, he almost shocks us by saying, carry on the work of making peace which the cross of Christ began, and even fill up what was lacking in the afflictions of Christ for the sake of the Church. The sharing by Christians of whatever is true of Christ includes not only their dying and rising with him, but their having even now their real life with him where he sits at God's right hand; and it is their destiny to be manifested in glory with him when he comes. These verses (3: 1–4) are as amazing in what they affirm about the relation of the Christian to Christ as the Logos verses are in what they affirm of Christ and his unique relation to the universe; but how is it possible to put the two passages together? One of them completely separates Christ from all other men; the other as completely unites every Christian with Christ, with the heavenly Christ no less than with the earthly. The earthly life of Jesus could be thought of only as a brief and strange interlude in the existence of the eternal creator and ordering reason and energy of the universe. But the heavenly Christ with whom the Christian already lives is none other than Jesus himself. He creates men after his own image, and those who have thus put off their old man and put on the new, which is Christlike, have the qualities which the Jesus of history manifested. It is directly from him that the character described in 3: 12–17 is drawn.

The Christology of the letter, apart from the Logos verses, is thus in complete agreement with the two fundamental tests of Paul's thinking; and it is also in accord with the two other characteristics that follow from them. It is from the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus that his reconciling work dates; it is his death and resurrection that men share when they experience his power to create them in his own likeness; so that to say that he is the "beginning" is the same as saying that he is the "firstborn from the dead"; his headship and primacy begin then (1: 18). It is also true that Paul's characteristic depth and intensity of personal feeling inspires his language about Christ in the letter as a whole. It is only in the Logos verses that the intellectual tone predominates, and our interest is necessarily centred in the things said, and in the question whether they are actually true, and how Paul could have supposed that he knew them to be true.

There are places in the letter where some reference by Paul to the Logos Christology would seem natural, but is missing, and there are a few phrases in which such a reference is commonly found. If we have the Logos poem in mind when we read of the mystery that had been hid from all ages but was now manifested, we naturally expect this mystery to be the high Christology. But it is not that to Paul. "The riches of the glory of this mystery" is something that has just happened, it is new not old; not Christ in creation as its originating and constituting principle, but "Christ in you [Gentiles] the hope of glory" (1:27). When Paul speaks of the fulness of God as dwelling in Christ bodily (2:9 cf. 1:19), we naturally think of some philosophical implication of the word "fulness," and of a relation of Christ to the omnipotence or omnipresence of God; but Paul is thinking of God's purpose to reconcile the alienated world to himself, and therefore of a kind of fulness which Christians can share with him who is the head (1:20–21, 2:10). Again when Paul is facing the dangers that threatened Christianity in Colossæ from a false philosophy, from some gnosis which led to an elaborate ritualism and to ascetic abstinences, we might expect that the true philosophy would be put in contrast to the false; and especially that the place of Christ as creator of all angelic powers (1:16) would be appealed to against the worship of angels. The headship of Christ is indeed set over against the "elements of the world," the nature powers which the Colossians are really worshipping in their festivals and rites, but it is because he has triumphed over them in his death, not because he created them; so that Christians have died with Christ from them, and have been raised to a new life (2:8–

23). That which Christ creates is not only the new man after his own image, the man who has put off anger, wrath, malice, and has put on a heart of compassion, kindness, and lowliness, but it is also the new united humanity that arises when men are so transformed. Where such men are "there cannot be Greek and Jew, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freemen; but Christ is all things and in all" (3:11).

But is not this last expression quite parallel to the "in him were all things created" of the Logos poem? No! on the contrary the difference between these two is such that it is hard to believe that they were spoken by one man. This "Christ is all things in all" is future not past; though it is already being achieved by Christ's creation of Christians. It is not because of his creation of the world, but because of his re-creation of humanity that such words could be applied to him; so that rather than suggesting the Logos doctrine it makes us realize how completely Paul's thinking about Christ is human and personal, and how far it is from any speculations about the beginnings and nature of the universe. It belongs to a totally different world of thought and of being from that in which the words "through him and unto him have all things been created, and in him all things consist" were framed. Paul uses the expression "all things" about Christ, his work, his destiny, with great freedom and boldness, but I believe that everywhere else except in the Corinthian creed and in this Colossian Logos passage he uses it with reference to personal not physical beings and events, and with an eye toward the future, not the past.

It is important, not only for its bearing on the Logos passage, but in its significance for Paul's thinking about Christ in general, to look more closely at his way of speaking about "all things." Perhaps the most surprising and revealing of such sayings is that with which he brings to a great culmination his protest against the party divisions in Corinth: "So let no one glory in men; for all things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present or things to come; all things are yours, but you Christ's, but Christ God's (I Cor. 3:21–23). All things belong ultimately to God, but if to God then to Christ, and if to Christ then to the Christian. The Christian is not to forget that the "all things" which he possesses are his because he is Christ's; yet Paul will not lessen the meaning of the phrase because he is applying it to men. Not only do Paul, Apollos, and Cephas belong to them all, so that division and rivalry over the question to which of these men they belong is absurd; but to them also belong the world, life, death, present and future. All that belongs to God belongs to the men who belong to Christ. If any one has thought that our second test has been put too boldly, and that Paul really does not apply to the Christian all that he affirms of Christ, this is a text for him to face.

But what meaning could Paul possibly have had in thus claiming for every Christian the possession of the same "all things" that belong to Christ and to God? In the sense in which possessions are outwardly reckoned it would have been as preposterous for him as it would be for us to say that to the Christian the world and life and death and things present and future belong. All things are yours, because you are Christ's, and they are Christ's because he is God's—this seems to be what his words imply. If then we can understand what he meant when he began by saying, "all things are yours," we shall better understand what he means when he says that all things are Christ's, or that Christ is all things and in all. In the sense of the Logos verses it would indeed be preposterous for its assertions to be transferred from Christ to the Christian. But when Paul says "all things are yours," he is thinking of the oneness between Christians which no jealousy or strife has the right or should have the power to disturb; and when he says, "Christ is all, and in all," he is thinking not of Christ's creation of the world, but of his power to create men after his image, so that the selfish self dies and the new man lives, in whom love prevails; and he sees that where there are such men the barriers that have divided nations and classes fall and all men become one. It is in the region in which the love of Christ, which is the love of God, operates and shows its divine and all-conquering power, that Paul ascribes to Christ the possession of all things and the power to subject all things to himself; and it is in that region that he finds it not an absurdity to ascribe all things in like manner to Christians, and to say to them, "All things are yours."

We are here certainly close to the centre and secret of Paul's Christology, to the real meaning to Paul of the great things that he says about Christ; and we find this meaning to be one that we can in our measure understand, because we can experience it in ourselves. If the love of Christ is the love of God, then God's own kingship over all things is the kingship of love, that is, of a Person whose power is love. This does not mean that something greater might be said of God, namely, his physical power over the material universe, but that Paul hesitates to affirm what he cannot know, and therefore limits God's power to things spiritual or personal. No, Paul is much bolder in his spiritualizing than that. The physical universe is not to him greater than the realm of persons and the inner life. It is the realm of highest reality in which all things belong to Christ and therefore to the Christian. The physical universe, so far as Paul cares to reflect upon it, is involved in the spiritual and dependent upon it. This seems to be the meaning of his vision of the creation, in bondage to corruption because of man's sin, waiting for the redemption which will come to it when it has come to men, and they appear in their new nature as sons of God (Romans 8:18–23).

It is only when with Paul we see God and all things in the light of Christ, that we can understand his otherwise extravagant or simply untrue assertions about "all things." It is only in this sphere of personality that nothing can be said of Christ or of God which is of a kind that cannot be known by men. In that sphere what belongs to God must because of its nature belong to men also; since there is both an inner necessity in God to impart it, and an inner impulse and obligation in man to attain it. The men who have been changed into this nature, who have the mind of Christ, have a part in the greatness of Christ. Such persons have in their possession spiritual properties and powers which make them superior to everything that divides men and creates enmity, to all desires for the possessions that one can have only at the expense of another, superior also to everything outward in the circumstances and happenings of their lives. They are on the side of the ultimate power and reality of the universe, and so have the power of the universe on their side. "We know that to them that love God *all things* work together for good." From the love of

God nothing can separate us, no trials, dangers, or sufferings of earth, and no spiritual powers of evil in worlds unseen. "I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know also how to abound: in everything and in all things have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want." Paul speaks almost like a Stoic, in proud superiority to all outward things; but quite unlike the Stoic is his concluding summary: "I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me."

The Christian is one in whom is the spirit of Christ, the spirit of humility and love; he is one who lives not to himself, who seeks not his own; and because these qualities, or the one inclusive quality of love, are God's and are Christ's, and because the Christian is Christ's, they not only are but should increasingly be the qualities of the Christian also; and not only should be but will be. For when Paul is saying these great things about God, about Christ, and about the Christian, he is saying things about which the truth is not altogether a present fact, but an ideal, a faith, and a hope. Even Christ's possession of all things is still future, though already present; and this, strange as it may sound, is true also of God. In Paul's great vision of the end, the subjection of all things to Christ will be accomplished through Christ's own reign and that of risen Christians with him; and when all things are at last in his possession, the universe will really belong to God, because love has at last brought it into harmony with him; then Christ will subject himself also to God, "that God may be all in all" (I Cor. 15:20–28). So it is not creation that gives God himself that possession of all things of which Paul is thinking.

His possession becomes fully a reality only when all evil has been destroyed. "All things in all" means, even when used of God, what it means when applied to Christ (Col. 3:11), the unification of all beings through love. Not the physical but the spiritual, the personal, is the highest reality that can be experienced by man, and the highest that men can affirm of Christ and of God. It is not a higher thing to say of Christ "all things were created through him and consist in him," than it is to say that when men have put off the old man and have put on the new, which Christ creates after his own image, then men will be one, and then Christ will be all in all. Paul undoubtedly prefers the second to the first of these expressions of the greatness of Christ. He interprets the Christian by Christ, but also Christ by the Christian. The Christian also, because he is Christ's, possesses all things; but to Christ also the possession of all things means not physical riches or power but a spiritual greatness which can and should be ours also. Christ frees the Christian from slavery to outward things and from the self-centred desires and fears which belong to that slavery. And the Christian's inner experience of Christ frees the Christ of his thinking from the sort of greatness that can be physically measured, and from the sort of divineness which because it is physically conceived can only separate him from us.

Passages such as those that we have been discussing give us a clear impression of the way in which Paul most naturally thinks of the relation of Christ to all things, of his possession of all and his power over all. It is a way that does not separate the master from the disciple. It is a way that Paul himself can follow, a possession and a power which every Christian can have, even though weakness, poverty, nothingness, are the marks of his outward lot. In immediate connection with his exultant "all things are yours" follows his sharp rebuke of those who think that they are rich and wise and strong and already reign as kings, and his picture of "us the apostles" as those who are fools for Christ's sake, weak, hungry, naked, and reviled. Where is there a parallel to such a contrast as this between I Cor. 3:21–23 and 4:8–13, except, indeed, in the Beatitudes of Jesus, and his teaching of the greatness of the least and lowliest, and the rulership of those who are servants of all? Christ's possession of all things belongs, according to Paul, not to the one through whom all things were made, nor yet primarily to him whom God has put at his right hand, but first to Jesus himself in his humility and self-sacrificing life and death. The parallel to Paul's strange and great conception is to be found only at the source from which he derived it, in Jesus himself.

Let us quote once more from the great picture of the Christian in his likeness to Christ as it culminates in one of the most characteristic of Paul's sayings about "all things": "As unknown, and well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and possessing all things" (II Cor. 6:9–10). If we can rightly hold these two together, "all things are yours," and "as having nothing, and possessing all things," and can see their meaning and their unity in Jesus, as Paul did, we shall find ourselves in the region in which Paul's thinking about Christ can be best understood; and we shall realize that it is a region in which it is impossible to find a natural place for the three Colossian Logos verses. Would not such assertions about Christ as these three verses make have been feared rather than welcomed by Paul? This Christ is not a person. Jesus himself is not recognizable in this description of his nature and work. The Christian cannot verify the things that are here said; he cannot know their truth; and even if he could know it, it would still be of less value than that which he knows already in his own inner experience; for it would belong to the realm of things; it would be a wisdom of this world, which only the "spirit of the world" could teach. Paul would have us interpret Christ's possession of all things by our own, as well as ours by his. And this does not mean a lowering of the sense in which all things belong to Christ. It is on the contrary a possession of all things which is like God's own. It belongs to Christ, not because he is human in contrast to divine, nor yet because he is divine in contrast to human, but because he is love, and convinces us that his love is the love of God. But if God is love, all things do not belong even to him as long as there is separation and enmity, hatred and fear, in the universe. So completely and consistently is the universe looked upon by Paul in terms of personality.

Paul was a Hebrew in his way of thinking, not a Greek. He could therefore affirm both of the two principal Old Testament sayings about the oneness of God: "The Lord our God, the Lord is one"; and also, "The Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day [the day of his future coming and triumph] shall the Lord be one and his name one" (Deut. 6:4; Zech. 14:9). To repeat the first, the Shema, was to take upon one the yoke of the Kingship of God, to acknowledge and undertake to obey his present, though invisible, rule as king; but in the second saying the faith becomes a hope, and the kingship and even the oneness of God are still future. This can only mean that the rule and the oneness of God have to do not with material things but with persons. The creation of all things would seem to involve God's possession of them and his power over them. But with persons the case is different. God is not in possession of the universe of personal beings unless there is a personal oneness of men with God and with one another answering to the oneness of God. In order that God may be king and may be one everything that causes division and enmity must be overcome. Even the confession of faith in the present oneness of God, in the Shema, contains the recognition that the oneness of God means on man's part love toward God with all the heart and soul and might. As long as men fail in love, that is, as long as they do not will to be one with God, God's own oneness remains not fully realized. As long as there is sin in the world, that is, division and hostility, God is not one, he does not possess all things. Paul's Christianity, we might say his Christology, consisted in his belief that Christ is the supreme act of the love of God, and that his function in the purpose of God, as the son of God's love, is to create sonship in men, through love to make love prevail, and so to unify God's universe, and in that sense to sum up all things in himself. God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. The love which abolishes barriers, makes peace, creates sons of God, is already present. We experience it in ourselves as the spirit of Christ, the spirit of sonship; and in and through us it must work on toward its consummation.

The Greek mind looked back to beginnings for the unity in which the explanation of the universe was to be found. Out of the oneness of the ultimate reason, energy, substance, comes the diversity of the actual world. This is a natural order of thought when it is the physical world that we are accounting for. Paul as a Hebrew believed indeed that the world was made by one God, but since as a Hebrew his interest was in the human world, not the physical, the oneness that he required was the oneness of all personal beings; and that oneness is not yet fully real.

In the prophetic passage God achieves oneness through a final victory over all hostile forces, the overthrow of all the nations that are enemies of his people, Israel. In Paul's Christian outlook also enmity and estrangement must end; but the oneness which love creates is that which overcomes the enemies of God through reconciliation, through changing enemies into friends. There is a great difference between looking backward and looking forward for the oneness of God and the world. The Christ of the Logos passage in Colossians is one in whom all things were made; but the Christ of Paul's Christianity was the one through whom the oneness of the world was to be achieved. This is the difference between Col. 1: 15–17 and 1: 18 ff. It is a difference that cannot be adjusted simply by saying that Paul added a Christology of salvation to his Christology of creation. These are two different fundamental attitudes of mind toward the problem of religion and the nature of God; and two fundamentally different types of Christianity result from putting Christ in the centre of the one or of the other. What Paul has to say about the relation of Christ and of Christians to "all things" leads us toward the confident result that Paul's religion is not of the Logos type. The world that Christ was creating, or God through Christ, is future not past. Love is no doubt the nature of God from eternity, but even God does not fully possess all that he loves until his love has not only given itself to all, but has been received and has become the answering love of all. Christ was certainly to Paul the one to whom God has intrusted the task of creating that oneness of love throughout the universe; and Christians are those in whom and through whom the task of making that oneness is to be carried on. God will not be all in all until Christ has first become all and in all; and that will not happen until his creation of his own image in men has made it impossible that there should be any longer Greek and Jew, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free man. Only when all men are constrained by the love of Christ will the old things pass away and all things become new. Christ is not, in Paul's Christianity, the one through whom God made the world, but the one through whom he is now making a new world. The Logos verses would seem to be impossible from one to whom God's own real possession of all things is still future, one to whom Christ is needed in order to secure God's complete possession of the world, and to whom Christians are needed in order that Christ may succeed in securing it.

The description of spirit-beings in 1:16 may seem at first a Pauline feature in the Logos verses. But in fact in Paul's other references to them the principalities and powers are evil spirits, and Christ's superiority to them means either that his reconciling work extends to those who are in the heavens as well as to all who are on earth, so that he will change their enmity to God into friendship (Col. 1:20, comp. Eph. 3: 10), or that he has triumphed over them (Col. 2: 15; I Cor. 15: 24), so that he is their head, and they must acknowledge his lordship (Col. 2: 10; Eph. 1: 21, comp. Phil. 2: 10), and so that Christians, though they must still fight against them (Eph. 6: 12), need not fear them any longer (Romans 8: 38–39). How can this attitude toward angelic powers of evil be adjusted to the conception that these all, with all other things, were created in Christ, and through him, and unto him, and have their being in him (Col. 1: 16–17)? Is it not inconceivable that the same Paul who says that it is God's will to reconcile all things to himself through Christ, whether on earth or in heaven, should think of the alienated and hostile angel powers as created in and through and unto Christ? How could Christ have the task of reconciling them to God, and, if reconciliation failed, of conquering them and triumphing over them, if all along they have their existence only in him? No, the cosmical Christ, the creator of all things, belongs to one view of the world, one type of religion, and the reconciling Christ, the one who brings peace into an alienated world through his cross, belongs to another; and there cannot be a moment's doubt over the question which of these is Paul's.

The Logos verses come from one to whom the uniqueness of Christ, his separateness from men, was absolute just because it was physically conceived; from one also to whom, as to the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon, the world is good because it was made by the Wisdom or Spirit of God and is filled with that spirit, physically filled and constituted by it. But Paul does not separate Christ from men in this way; and in Paul's view there are real evils in the world, evils in human nature and in the nature of things.

Christ is not one who, as creator of all things and the being in which all things exist, guarantees the goodness of all things; but one who has power to change evil to good, to make all things new.

It is then with a strong impression that the three Logos verses are not Paul's that we return to the problem of their presence in his letter and of their relation to the verses that immediately follow them. Paul might have quoted a current Logos Hymn to Christ which was not his own. If he did so it would have been due, in part, to his willingness to become all things to all men, in this case to become as a Greek to Greeks. But the verses immediately following must then have been added with a purposed parallelism in form, but a contrast in contents, as if he would say, You may believe in Christ as the Logos through whom God made all things if you please, but do not fail to add to Christ the creator the Christ whom God raised from the dead that he might be the beginning and head of God's new work of reconciling all things unto himself, and you who were alienated. But if this had been Paul's procedure we should expect to find some suggestion of it, some such warning as the Corinthian creed called forth against the dangers of such intellectual formulations of Christian belief, such assertions of things beyond our reach and beyond our power to understand, and especially against the separation of Jesus from men and of men from one another which such formulas are certain to produce.

I believe, therefore, that the more probable explanation of the actual relationship between the three Logos verses and those that follow is that they were inserted in Paul's letter by some one whose religion had been that of the

Logos type of Hellenistic Judaism, and whose Christianity would necessarily have been of the same type. Such a one might naturally feel that in what Paul said of Christ, in verses 18–23, the greatest things had been omitted. Paul calls Christ the head of the church, the beginning, whereas he was in reality also the beginning of the creation. Paul says that he was in all things first, but does not make it clear that all things mean the universe. He says that he was the firstborn from the dead, but he should have said also that he was the firstborn of all creation. Paul says that through Christ God reconciled all things to himself, but it surely ought to be said, first, that through him God made and sustains all things. Paul says that the reconciliation through the cross of Christ includes things in the heavens as well as things on earth; but it ought to be said that the things invisible, the principalities, and powers, were created through him and unto him. So I conceive that verses 15–17 were shaped with the definite purpose of supplementing Paul's Christology of reconciliation at every point by a Christology of creation. To the one who framed these sentences their natural place was before verses 18–23, because the greater things should be said first, Christ's place as head of all creation belongs before his place as head of the church. The writer of this supplement would not doubt that it expressed greater things, and was a higher Christology, than Paul's. He might feel justified in assuming that Paul would assent to it because his letter contained such sentences as "that in all things he might have the priority," "that in him should all the fulness dwell," "Christ is all and in all." He would naturally not see that he was really contradicting Paul. But Paul himself would certainly not have been pleased. He would have seen clearly enough the contradiction and the danger, the practical substitution of the Logos for Jesus which this insertion involved.

That such a Greek Christian should have been impelled to go from Paul, upward as he doubtless thought, to something more universal, and should have believed that this deserved a place before Paul's more human interpretation, seems quite natural. That Paul should have written the Logos verses first and then gone on with verses 18–23 seems unnatural and hardly credible. His whole letter is in accordance with what precedes and follows, for verses 12–14 also have to do only with the Christian church, with the kingdom of the Son whom God loved. The only nature-religion to which he refers is one that he emphatically rejects as nothing but the substitution of a religion "according to the elements of the world" for that which is according to Christ (2:8). The fulness of the deity is indeed in Jesus, but in a sense that Christians can share. "In him ye are made full." He is "the head of all principality and power," but it is as he is head of the church, through his death and resurrection. That very contrast between the elements and Christ, and Paul's appeal, "If ye died with Christ from the elements of the world, why . . . subject yourselves to ordinances?" are proof that Paul does not think as the writer of the Logos verses does, to whom these elements, these spirits of nature's forces and processes, would have been among the beings created through Christ and existing in him.

The way in which God in Christ is removing enmity from his universe is not through the power that belongs to Christ as creator and sustainer of all things, but through the love of Christ, and especially through his love at its highest on the cross. And this making of peace is a task which Christians are to carry forward in Christ's way. In this Christianity of Paul the Logos-Christology is an alien element. Paul did indeed know it: his citation of the Corinthian creed is proof of that; but it is also proof that he was not responsible for it, and that he did not like the value that the Corinthians put upon it, and its effects upon them. While in Colossians the presence of this sort of higher Christology seems due not even to quotation by Paul but to a most natural desire on the part of some to whom this was the supreme truth about Christ to have it included in Paul's letter to them.

The consequences of the conviction that the Logos verses do not express Paul's own thinking about Christ are so important that it has seemed necessary to discuss the matter at some length, and we shall still have it in mind as we turn to other letters of Paul.

There is a difference of opinion about the authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and we should not therefore give decisive weight to its testimony; but I cannot but think that it is of some importance to observe that in this book, which, whether it is by Paul or not, is closely related to Colossians, and appears to depend upon it, there is no allusion whatever to the three Logos verses. Apart from this, the Christology of Ephesians is closely like that of Colossians. Christ has a unique relation here also to "all things," but it is a relation that he attains through his resurrection. That which he has to do with all things, that is, that which God does through him, is the work of reconciliation, the creation of peace and oneness in a divided world. In this unifying work that which seemed to the writer the wonder of wonders, the mystery of God and of Christ, long hidden but now revealed, was the removal of the distinction between Jews and Gentiles, and the acceptance of Gentiles as fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the household of God. All this is in accordance with the purpose of God from the beginning. God's eternal purpose was, in the fulness of the times, to bring all things to a head in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth. The new dispensation of which Christ is head was introduced by that mighty deed of God when he raised Christ from the dead and exalted him above all powers in both worlds. "He put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." In these passages (1:10, 19–23), or in connection with them, we should look for a hint of the Logos verses of Colossians; but we find nothing but a parallelism, which is close, to the verses following directly after them (Col. 1:18–20). Jesus Christ is indeed the great deed of God in the history of the world, his greatest deed in the carrying out of his eternal purpose; but his work is that of redemption, not of creation, and it begins with Jesus himself, his death and resurrection. "Now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ." He is "our peace." He abolished the enmity, that is, the law, that he might create in himself of all men, Jews and Gentiles, one new man. Christ is "the head over all things to the church, his body," but it is God alone who created all things (3:9), whose fulness fills all things (1:23); and to him alone the Stoic formula of omnipotence is ascribed in the author's striking confession of faith in unity: it is the "one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all" (4:4–6). When he says of Christ, "that he might fill all things," he is interpreting Psalm 68:18 as meaning that Christ descended (not from heaven to earth, but from earth into Hades), and ascended far above the heavens; and because he had thus visited and made himself at home in all three parts of the universe he could be said to fill all things. The phrase involves no Stoic pantheism. It describes not what came before, but what followed after Christ's life on earth.

The entire absence of Col. 1:15–17 in Ephesians is, indeed, in accordance with the fact that the writer has an entirely different conception of the pre-existence of Christ, which fills and satisfies his mind and kindles his feeling. The mystery of God's will "to sum up all things in Christ," to make peace and unity in the divided world, was "the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." Only in the sense that this purpose is older than creation, and that Christ is central in it, does he belong before the worlds; but their maker he is not. Moreover, pre-existence in the purpose of God is affirmed not only of Christ but of every Christian as well. "Even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before him in love: having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself" (1:4–5). But though God's purpose is eternal, Christ himself and his headship date from the fulness of the times, when Christ having died was raised by God and made head over all. This is all fully in accordance with Col. 1:18–23, but belongs to a world-view totally different from that of the Logos, and is as thoroughly Hebraic as that is distinctively Greek. Although this can certainly be called a very high Christology yet it does not separate Christ from the Christian, for God "has made us alive together with Christ . . . and raised us up with him and made us to sit with him in the heavenly [places], in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:5–6, comp. Col. 3:1–4).

The evidence that the author of Ephesians, whether Paul or another, did not have the Logos verses in his copy of Colossians has a certain weight, though it would, of course, be inconclusive by itself. There are other things in Colossians to which Ephesians does not refer. But the book does, I think, add force to the impression that the Logos Christology is alien to any consistent Paulinism. The place of Christ in the Christianity of Ephesians is in agreement with our four tests: The resurrection is its beginning. The place of Christ is one which Christians share with him. The work of Christ is not done by him alone; Paul also has a great responsibility for it (3:1–4, 8 ff.); and it can only work itself out through the Christlike mind and effort of all Christians, to each one of whom a special grace is given. The character which Christians must have in order to create this ultimate unity is that of Jesus himself (4:1–5:21). The language throughout is eloquent and impassioned. It is hard, for example, to attribute the great prayer of 3:14–19 to any one but Paul himself. Its conception of the Christian's knowledge of Christ as a knowing of the love of Christ, as being all-comprehensive in its range, its goal too high to be attained, being nothing less than "that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God," is certainly inspired by no one but Paul.

3. IN THE FORM OF GOD

Another and a peculiarly strong argument against Paul's being the author of the Logos Christology and against the originality of the Colossian Logos verses is to be found in the Epistle to the Philippians, which contains also a very important and difficult Christological problem of its own. Paul is here writing to a Greek church, one of his own founding, as the church in Colossæ was not. If he had gradually come to the height of his Christological thinking in the Logos doctrine, we should expect him in writing later to the Philippians to go further still in that direction. But instead there is an entire absence of any allusion to a Logos Christology, or any suggestion of its influence on Paul's thinking, although the letter is peculiarly full of Christ. But our surprise at not finding the Logos Christology here is surpassed by the surprise of finding a description of the pre-existence of Christ of a totally different kind. Two accounts of his pre-existence and of his relation to God and to the world could not well be more completely different in character than are those in Col. 1:15–17 and Phil. 2:6–11.

It is important to recognize the fundamental nature of the difference. In the Colossian passage Jesus is identified with that reason or wisdom of God which is the first of created things, through which, as if it were a physical energy or substance which went forth from the mind of God, all other things were made, and in it have their existence. This ultimate reality before and within all things must have been to the writer of these verses in some sense personal, because it is in some sense identified with Jesus; but no personal qualities or operations are ascribed to it. It is identified with Jesus but shows no trace of his influence: it has not in any way been subjected to him. In the Philippian passage Jesus himself pre-exists in heaven as a wholly personal being, of divine nature, who came to earth by voluntary choice, by an act of self-renunciation in which he rejected the tempting possibility of seizing upon greater possessions and powers than those which he already had, even those of God himself. Instead of this he emptied himself and became as man, and among men as a slave, accepting even death and the most shameful of deaths. And because of his self-denial, his refusal to emulate God, his reverence, obedience, and humility, God exalted him and gave him the supreme name and place of Lord. What he had refused as a thing to be grasped, God gave him because he had refused it and chosen its opposite. It is a picture on a grand scale of the truth that he that humbles himself shall be exalted. As a story about a divine being and his choices and actions in times and in places which are entirely out of reach of our human knowledge the story must be called mythical.

We may say that it attempts an answer in the form of a myth to the three questions about Christ, whence? of what nature? of what name? as the Logos verses attempt a philosophical answer to the same questions. Surely one who thought that he was actually describing Christ's eternal nature in the Colossian verses could not have described the same pre-existent being in the terms of the Philippian story. The background of the one is Stoic philosophy as Hellenistic Judaism had adopted it. The other seems to imply a background not so foreign to views of the world which Paul had inherited. The picture implies an unseen world peopled by personal spirits, some of whom may have yielded to the temptation to seize upon the throne of God. Perhaps some who failed in that effort and fell from heaven may have taken possession of this world, as if by an act of robbery. What else could account for the fact, which was a fact to Paul also, that the present world was ruled by powers of evil? We cannot say how early the idea became current in Israel that Satan himself fell through such an effort to exalt his throne above God's, to make himself like the Most High. There seem to be allusions to such stories in Isaiah 14: 12–15 and Ezek. 28: 2, 6, 9, 12 ff., where they are applied to the pride and the fall of Babylon and of Tyre. In any case the ambition to be as God was that which the tempter held with such baleful success before Adam and Eve, who had been made in the image of God. And it was with a similar offer of the possession of the world that he finally undertook and failed to persuade Jesus to acknowledge him and to defy God. Whether it has any relation to the Temptations or not, the story in Philippians does picture Christ as a divine being who rejected the Satanic impulse to attempt equality with God by an act of violence, who chose the opposite way of humility and obedience, became as man, instead of attempting to become as God, and was lifted up by God to the highest place because he would not grasp it when it seemed to be within his reach.

The story is told in poetic form; and the parts are so carefully shaped and balanced, with an art so conscious, and a completeness so evidently intended, that it is not easy to think of it as a spontaneous part of Paul's dictated letter. It seems like a quotation. But if so is Paul quoting himself? That is our natural supposition in the case of some of the poetic parts of his letters, where the poetry is elaborate but its contents and language are unmistakably Paul's; for example, in the praise of Christian wisdom and in the hymn in praise of love (I Cor. 2:6–16; 13:1–13). Had Paul composed also this hymn to Christ, so that the Philippians might have known it already as his? There are reasons for doubting this, and for thinking that he quotes a hymn that was current and familiar, but not his own. This view has recently been argued by Lohmeyer in his commentary on Philippians, and in a separate monograph on this passage.* His primary reasons for denying Pauline authorship are the carefully measured strophic form, the fact that it is only loosely connected with its context, and especially that it contains a number of words or expressions that are strange to Paul. But he points out also un-Pauline features in the story itself: that Christ's coming to earth has no relation to men and their redemption; that the exaltation of Christ to lordship takes the place of Paul's emphasis on the resurrection; and that the hymn has to do only with Christ's relation to God and to the world, and leaves no place for Paul's ruling conception of the church and the spirit. Lohmeyer thinks it the *locus classicus* of primitive Christology, containing the beginnings of both the Pauline and the Johannine types. He reads into it much more than it contains, not only the explanation of the confession, Jesus is Lord, but the ideas of the Son of Man, the Servant of Isaiah 53, even the Logos, and still further the primitive Christian metaphysics of the two worlds, the divine and the human, and their relation to each other. But while questioning many of his positions I

***Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2: 5–11.* Heidelberg, 1928.

am convinced that the judgment that Paul is quoting a hymn which he did not write is the most probable explanation of its presence here. The importance of the passage in the history of Christian thinking about Christ is so great that I must indicate the main reasons which had already led me to that conclusion, and are still to me the most convincing. They are involved in a comparison of the poem with three other passages: the verses which introduce it (2:1–5); the only verse in Paul's letters which seems to be parallel to it (II Cor. 8:9); and the description of Paul's own experience which follows after it (Phil. 3:4–21).

The first of these passages gives the occasion for the quotation of the poem by Paul. It is in these verses that we should look, not indeed for its original purpose and meaning, but certainly for Paul's purpose in quoting it. The verses are one of Paul's great descriptions of the mind of one who is "in Christ." Since this is the mind of love, it is creative of unity; it is one mind, the same love; it leaves no room for party divisions or for self-centred conceit; comfort, fellowship, compassion, belong to it, lowliness of mind, and the loss of self for others' good. We need not ask, because we know so well, the source from which came every thought and the whole single ideal in these four most Pauline verses. They came to Paul directly and altogether from Jesus himself. The human Jesus filled Paul's mind when he urged Christians to be of one way of thinking, and to count others better than themselves.

Then he quotes the hymn, making the transition by the verse which reads in our versions: "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." The Greek is not quite so clear as this, and there have been various efforts to weaken the connection between the four verses and the unexpected picture with which Paul apparently means to illustrate and enforce them. The last of these efforts is Lohmeyer's, who makes the first half the conclusion of what precedes: "So be ye minded," and the second half the introduction to the poem: "This [see ye] also in Jesus Christ." Then having as it were cut the two passages apart, he makes no use of verses 1–4 in his discussion of the hymn,—surely a most serious mistake.

Paul has been characterizing and urging a certain mind, a way of thinking, he calls it, using a word that means not only thinking, but feeling, choice and purpose, a total attitude of the inner self, the personality, especially one's attitude toward his fellow-men. It is, as his readers know, the mind of Christ, the kind of thinking and feeling and willing that was in him. Paul's purpose then in quoting the hymn is to put before them as in a picture that mind in Christ which should also be in them. With so unmistakable an introduction it would be a totally unjustifiable procedure to assume that Paul turns to Christology, and undertakes to answer the question, which some suggest that he had left unanswered in the Colossian Logos passage, how the pre-existent divine Christ became man. Paul is repeating the hymn not in order to explain the peculiarity of Christ's nature, that which separates him from men, but to put before his readers' eyes the Christ whom they are to imitate, whose mind he has just defined. Would not Paul have been surprised and dismayed if he could have foreseen that men would evolve doctrines of the incarnation out of the words, "he emptied himself"? Whatever the writer of the hymn may have meant by these words, Paul meant, when he quoted them, not something peculiar to Jesus, involved in the fact that for him alone among men the earthly life must be somehow adjusted to his former and still essentially divine nature, but something that every Christian should repeat in his own choices and actions. To empty oneself was to have the self-less mind of one who counts others better than himself. What Paul wanted his readers to see in the poem was only what he had been urging them to be and do. To Paul it was a hymn in praise of the humility and self-sacrifice of Jesus, and pictured God's recognition of the beauty and the glory of these qualities by enthroning as Lord him in whom they were revealed in their true nature. Paul could quote the hymn because it was, in that measure, according to Jesus. He would have been in agreement also with its representation of the lordship of Jesus as conferred upon him by God after and because of his earthly life and death.

But although we can understand how Paul could have quoted the hymn to illustrate and enforce the thoughts of the verses that introduce it, these verses do constitute a strong reason for the belief that he did not himself compose it. They require a Christ whom men can imitate, but the hymn seems definitely meant to describe a Christ whom men cannot regard as an example, because he is not really human. The Christ of the hymn was divine before he was human, and is now divine with a still higher title and authority. The veil of unreality is cast over his earthly life by phrases that seem meant to suggest that he was not really human. We shall see how different Paul's thought is about the earthly life of Jesus even in such passages as Romans 1:3–4; 8:3. The true humanity of Jesus is never doubted by Paul. It is essential to his Christian faith and experience. Without it there could be no real oneness of the Christian with Christ, and no real knowledge of Christ by the Christian. In the introductory verses the ideal of the Christian life is drawn from Jesus himself, not from the heavenly being of the hymn that follows. The humility and self-denial of Jesus have the motive of love and the purpose of doing good to others; but in the hymn the self-denial has not that motive; the coming of Christ to earth, his humility and death, are not for the sake of men and their redemption, but express and prove only reverence and obedience toward God. The hymn, therefore, is only partly according to Jesus, since it lacks the spirit of love and the aim of ministry; and it is not at all according to the Christian, since its Christ is not human, and the real action of the drama, both the decisive choice of Christ and the act of God, take place in heaven, not on earth. Christ came to earth as an act of submission and obedience to God, and in reward for this God exalted him to heavenly glory.

The Christ of the hymn is a divine being who became the highest of all in the heavenly realm because he chose to be least of all, to be one with man, when he might have aspired to be one with God. In the history of such a being the earthly life could be only a brief interval during which he became voluntarily something less than his real nature. The real Christ of the poem belongs to eternity. Such a being is beyond the reach of our knowledge. But Paul's Christianity rests on the reality of our knowledge of Christ. We can know him because he was one with us, and because we have through him the right to become one with him. When Paul cites the hymn, therefore, in order to illustrate and impress his admonitions by showing that the mind he would have in them was also in Christ Jesus, he assumes that there is in the picture something that is not expressed, which he trusts his readers to supply, namely that Christ's coming to earth, which the hymn describes as a supreme act of humility toward God, was also a supreme act of love toward men. Paul is speaking in the introductory verses of the self-sacrifices which are the natural expression of love. The entire absence of this motive in the poem is the chief reason for the conviction that Paul could not have written it. If it had been inspired by the wonderful verses that introduce it, and Paul had turned poet on the inspiration of the moment, it is impossible that he should have omitted the main thing that he wished to enforce by this appeal to the example of Christ. And he could never in any case have written a great hymn to Christ in which that love, that self-sacrifice for others, which is the nature of Paul's Christ and the explanation of all that he did and was and suffered, was not central, was not even present at all. The careful construction of the poem, and its completeness, carrying the story of Christ from its heavenly beginnings through the earthly life to its consummation in heaven again, are evidence that it expressed what had long been the essential things, and everything essential, in the Christian faith of its author. If then the essentials of Paul's Christ are not contained in it, that can only mean that he was not its author. The hymn was the Christology of its maker, and it is not that of Paul. Paul did not quote it in order to explain a kind of oneness of man with God which happened once only in human history, but to enforce the sort of oneness which the preceding verses describe, which was indeed that of Christ, but should be also that of every Christian. He certainly quoted the hymn to strengthen his admonitions in verses 1–4, but it is equally certain that it was not composed for that purpose. If the hymn was familiar to Paul and to his readers he could have quoted it, assuming that, after what he had just said, they would supply the missing motive. That he did not add this main thing himself would be due to the fact that he was citing a familiar and finished poem.

Fortunately we have in our second passage direct evidence of the way in which Paul would have shaped this story of the divine being who comes to earth if he had himself composed a poem on that theme. Paul is urging the Christians of Corinth to self-denying generosity in giving, as in Philippians he is urging Christians to the self-denial involved in the spirit of unity and sacrifice of self for others' good. In neither case is he discussing Christological doctrine. He is not meaning to raise or answer any question about Christ's nature and the way in which he became man. He writes, "You know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that for your sake he became poor, being rich, that you by his poverty might be enriched." Paul seems to be alluding to the same story which he quoted in fuller form in Philippians. But here he lets all the details of the story go. The questions that curiosity inevitably asks about the nature of that wealth, and the nature of the acts by which it was given up, when and how and in what sense Christ became poor, do not interest Paul in the least. He does not even add that after the poverty there followed wealth again, and greater than before. Only with one thing is Paul concerned, that Christ's becoming poor, although he is rich, was "for your sakes," it was "that ye through his poverty might become rich." So here we have as the main thing in Paul's allusion to the story exactly that which the verses that introduce it in Philippians require, but the story as it is there told entirely lacks. The use of the story which Paul had made in the Corinthian letter adds its great weight to the implications of Phil. 2:1–5, and makes Paul's free authorship of the hymn seem almost an impossibility. It seems almost certain that Paul is quoting a poem so finished and fixed in form that he cannot change it, and that he depends on the connection to add the interpretation of it in his own sense, the sense which II Cor. 8:9 completely expresses.

Apart from its connection the hymn in Philippians describes Christ in his complete separateness from men; but in Corinthians the story has become so completely subjected to Jesus himself that it is in full accordance with Paul's principle that what is said of Christ be true of the Christian also. For Christ is not here one who gives only that we may receive. He gives in order that we also may give. Paul well knew the paradox which Jesus taught and exemplified, that riches of the kind that he possessed must be given up in order to be gained, they must be lost in order to be kept; and he knew that this is as true of the Christian as of Christ. Paul reminds them of the willing poverty of Christ for their enrichment in order that they may be inspired in like manner to be poor that still others may become rich. "As poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and possessing all things." These words, at the end of Paul's picture of the Christian in his likeness to Christ, earlier in the same letter (II Cor. 6:10), interpret the verse we are considering, and together they give us the key to Paul's understanding of the Philippian hymn, to that which he read into it as the real meaning both of the self-denial and humility of Jesus and of his exaltation, his possession of all things. It is a higher meaning than the hymn itself contains, and it is also a meaning which applies not to Christ alone, but to every man who is in Christ. By subjecting the story to Jesus himself Paul changes it from its original purpose, which was to describe the separateness of Christ from men, his original divineness of nature, and his attainment of the supreme separateness of lordship, and uses it as a picture of precisely that in Christ which should be in us. Paul's interest was not in that which separates Christ from men, that is, his interest was not the prevailing interest of the creeds and theologies that were to come after him, and of those also which came before him. The problem of the Christian religion to Paul was not that of separating Christ from men, but that of uniting men with Christ; it was therefore not a problem of thought in the sense of science or philosophy, but of a new mind, a new inner life, and a new power for the attaining of it. Paul believed that what Christ was every man should be, and because of him can become in ever increasing measure. With this we are prepared to look at the third of the passages that interpret the Christological hymn of Philippians.

I have not found that the parallelism between the hymn to Christ and Paul's account, in the following chapter, of his own experiences has been used as a clue to the interpretation of his Christology; but it seems to me that it is a far more important Christological passage than the hymn itself. We need not assume that Paul was consciously working out this parallelism. This story of his religious life is as spontaneous and passionate as the life of Christ in the hymn is artfully fashioned. But the parallelism may be all the more significant if it was unintended. Here we have at the end of Paul's writings one of the most fully Pauline of all Paul's confessions of faith and accounts of his Christian experience, and one of the most remarkable revelations of what it meant to him to know Christ. It begins with a description of the wealth which Paul possessed as a Jew, of the things in which he excelled, things that set him apart as superior to others. Like Christ he gave up what he naturally valued and counted his gain but loss, in order that through self-emptying and humility, through suffering and death, he might gain higher possessions than those which he had cast away.

Paul's sharing of Christ's lot involved outward sufferings and death, and he looked forward toward an outward rising and a transformation into the heavenly nature of the exalted Christ. Yet to Paul the dramatic action of his life in likeness to Christ was essentially inward. It consisted in moral choices and in strenuous moral endeavors. And so Paul describes it, when he sums it up, as having a certain mind (3: 15). It is the same mind, the same total attitude of the inner self, that he described in 2: 1–4 and that he quoted the hymn in order to illustrate. It is only when the hymn is looked at in the light of Paul's parallel experience of gain, and loss, and higher gain, that we can understand how he could have cited it as picturing the mind that was in Christ, and could wish and expect others to share that experience: "As many of us as are perfect, let this be our state of mind." It is because Paul's experiences are primarily inward and because his new gains are according to Christ, that they do not, as his former gains did, separate him from others. On the contrary, what others see in him he summons them to desire and strive after for themselves: "Be fellow-imitators of me."

Even to the high goal of the drama of Christ, the glory that God gave him because of his humility, there will be a real parallel in the drama of the Christian. The Christian life is already heavenly, and at last the earthly nature will be so changed that the Christian's likeness to Christ will include even a bodily sharing of the divineness of his heavenly nature, "according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself" (3: 17–21). So Paul's account of the Christian life, his own and that of others, follows the whole course of the drama of the life of Christ in the hymn which he quoted. That story of Christ can become the story of the Christian only because Paul thinks of it as essentially acted in the inner life. When the drama of Christ in the hymn is interpreted by Jesus it can then be transferred to Paul himself and to every Christian, and so cease to separate Christ from men.

The hymn as it stands recounts facts in time and place, in heaven, on earth, and in heaven again, facts which set Jesus wholly apart from all other beings whether men or angels in an apartness which is greater at the end than at the beginning; but when it is interpreted according to Christ, it becomes creative of the same experiences in men. Outward sufferings, outward death, resurrection, transformation into a heavenly nature, belong to Paul's picture of Christ, and they all belong also to Paul's own and to every Christian's experience in the imitation of Christ. Sufferings were what Paul was daily experiencing, a martyr-death was what he was looking forward to; yet to him fellowship with the sufferings of Christ, conformity to his death, the experience of the power of his resurrection, were all present inward experiences, ideals and endeavors; and Paul says of them all that they constitute that knowledge of Christ which was the gain for which he had gladly lost all his former gains, great though they were.

We are trying to understand Paul's thinking about Christ, his Christology; and here in the third chapter of Philippians he tells us exactly, with concrete detail and with the passion which is the seal of truth, what he meant by knowing Christ. To know Christ is to share all things with Christ, and make true in ourselves all that is true in him. To know Christ is to lay hold of him in the same way as that in which he lays hold of us. In what he says of this Christian knowledge of Christ, which is the Christian's becoming as Christ, Paul sometimes asserts it as a fact, sometimes appeals to it as a motive, and sometimes strives after it, and would have others strive, as a high and distant goal. To understand Paul's thinking about Christ, his Christology, we must therefore ask what kind of knowledge of Christ it is which we already have because Christ is in us, and yet must strive after with all the powers of our entire natures; in which we can rejoice and feel free, sufficient, independent of all men and of all human traditions and institutions, and yet by it be also challenged to sacrifice all else that we may attain it. If this is what Paul means by knowing Christ, and if Christology is the expression of the Christian's knowledge of Christ, then Paul's Christology could be, at its highest, nothing but Paul himself, as in him

Christ again lived and suffered, died and rose; and every Christian's Christology, his explanation and demonstration of what Christ is, must be the mind which he himself possesses and manifests.

The meaning of the hymn as Paul understood it and wished it to be understood, as he subjected it to Jesus and interpreted it by him, would seem to be put beyond doubt by the three passages from which we have sought light upon his use of it. The hymn contains a doctrine of preexistence, but Paul does not use it because of that, but to illustrate the mind of Christ which should also be the mind of Christians.

But it is natural for us still to regret Paul's citation of the hymn. If he wished to appeal to the example of Jesus, from whom in fact came the mind and conduct which he was urging, why did he not quote some saying of Jesus himself, or some incident illustrating his compassion, his lowliness of mind, his self-sacrifice for others' sake? That he should here cite a mythical story instead of Jesus himself is to many the most convincing proof that he did not care much about the earthly Jesus, and probably did not know much about him; and it seems most natural to many students of Paul to infer, chiefly from this instance, that what Paul really did was exactly the opposite of that which we have been maintaining, that instead of thinking about the Christ of Christian faith according to the Jesus of history, or even according to the same Jesus in the Christian's inner experience, he substituted for Jesus himself this mythical figure, as in Colossians he substituted a philosophical abstraction, both of them provided by his age. So Paul becomes the natural author of that "higher Christology" which is higher only in the sense that it has nothing to do with the person Jesus in his human actuality, but only with past or future cosmical or heavenly beings and processes.

We should all, I am sure, agree that if Paul had quoted at this point sayings of Jesus or incidents from his life, if he had done what he is reported to have done when, urging the Ephesian elders to "help the weak," he added, "and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus . . . It is more blessed to give than to receive," we should have been peculiarly grateful to him. For one more such utterance of Jesus, for the least addition to the gospel traditions, of which we have so few in the writings of Paul, we would gladly exchange this hymn to Christ, which only excites our curiosity about its origin, and its relationship to Jewish or heathen conceptions, but adds nothing to our knowledge of Jesus. Just why Paul chose to do what he did we can never know. He was not writing for us and our needs. He was writing to a church which already knew from him all that he knew, which was much, about Jesus, and did not need proof that the mind that he had just described was nothing but the mind of Christ. There must have been some special reason why Paul wanted to have the Philippians read this hymn in the sense in which he interpreted it, the sense in which he summed it up in II Corinthians. Our comparison of the four introductory verses with the hymn itself has shown how much had to be read between the lines if it were really to serve his purpose. The hymn lacks the chief thing, the motive of love behind the self-denial of Jesus, and the purpose to lift others up through his condescension.

If the hymn were old and popular may it not have been Paul's purpose in quoting it, after the four verses, to suggest that it should be understood in the sense that these verses express, that the Christ of these verses be carried over and thought of as the Christ of the hymn? And may it not be that the difficult form of the connecting verse has its explanation in this purpose? Remember, he would say, when you repeat the hymn in praise of Christ, that his mind, his feeling, his purpose, were such as I have been urging upon you as the mind of all who belong to him. Do not think of it as a record of facts which lie outside of our reach to verify, or, if we accept them, to understand. Interpret the Christ of the hymn by the Christ whose mind you know, because he has created it in you. You are, or ought to be, inwardly more like Christ than the hymn is; so put into its Christ what Christ has put into you as his real self. The historical Jesus is not the source of the picture in Philippians 2:6–11, but he is the source of the ideals in verses 1–4. Verse 5 connects them, but means, perhaps, not that they are the same, but that they ought to be: "Let this be the mind which is in you, and this also the mind which you see in Christ," when you speak in praise of him.

It has seemed necessary to dwell at some length on the two principal passages from which Paul's "higher Christology" has been derived. Taken by themselves, apart from their connection and from everything else in Paul, these two passages, the three verses in Colossians and the six verses in Philippians, do not express Paul's way of thinking about Christ. Taken literally and objectively they could not both express any one man's way, for they belong to two different views of the world, and cannot make a single picture. The divine reason and power that first planned and then made the world cannot be identified with one of the heavenly beings who resisted the temptation to grasp equality with God, and chose instead to become as man. Both passages differ from Paul in the fact that they separate Christ from men, and do not leave room for that oneness of the Christian with Christ which is the essence of Paul's Christianity. Paul could allow these descriptions of Christ to stand only if they were subjected to Jesus and interpreted by him. The Logos conception could not be so subjected. There is little room for love in a being so impersonal. When therefore Paul first introduced it, in I Cor. 8:6, he could do nothing except urge those who held the Stoic creed to have also the spirit of Jesus, and to let that control them in the use of their new knowledge, though it could not control the knowledge itself. To Paul the knowledge did not constitute their Christianity. Many were Christians who did not have it. Let those who did have it be sure that they have also Jesus himself. The story of the Philippian hymn was not so impossible to subject to Jesus, and in Paul's first brief allusion to it he does make it altogether a picture of the self-denying and redemptive love of Christ.

It is a striking fact that the earlier and shorter forms of both of the two Christologies were more Christian than were the later more elaborate forms. The fact that in the hymn there is no "for you," no "that ye through his poverty might be enriched," and the fact that in the Colossian Logos verses we do not find the "and we unto him," "and we through him," of the Corinthian creed, are perhaps indications of the danger which Paul felt in Christologies of such sorts, which do not begin with Jesus himself but move in the mysterious spaces and times before and beyond him. Such Christologies showed a tendency from the first to become less Christian. They tended to lose the features of Jesus himself and in effect to substitute themselves for him, rather than to transform themselves into his image. Paul certainly saw and feared that tendency, and in his effort to correct it we may find the underlying motive which prompted him to quote the hymn, as illustrating the mind of Jesus, instead of appealing directly to Jesus himself.

The view that I have advocated in regard to these two passages would require for its fuller justification a review of others' opinions which is not here possible.* I shall mention two names, however, in order to make clearer the nature and importance of the issues involved. In 1904 Wrede published the famous little book on Paul (in English, 1908) which called forth at the time a literature both of praise and of criticism. Wrede argued that Paul's picture of Christ did not originate in any impression of the personality of Jesus. The whole concrete contents, ethical and religious, of the earthly life of Jesus signified for Paul's Christology nothing whatever. His Christ is a purely superhuman being, of whom we get a clear conception only from Phil. 2:6–11. Into the outlines of this mythical story Wrede inserts the few other pssages to which he can appeal (*e. g.*, I Cor. 15:45, Romans 1:4, 8:3; Col. 1:15–17). From the Philippian passage alone Wrede draws the inference that the Jesus of Paul was a man only outwardly, only in his body; that in thought, feeling and will he was not a real man, since one who is in substance divine could not have a truly human consciousness. It was only "in form," "in likeness," that he was human. This complete substitution of a mythological being for the historical Jesus was possible to Paul only because as a Jew he had believed in such a divine Messiah. For the sake of this, Wrede finds that Paul wholly sacrificed the human, the personal, the ethical, in Jesus; so that we later Christians are faced with an absolute alternative: we have to choose between Jesus and Paul. This is the consequence of the procedure, quite incredible in the case of a scholar so able as Wrede, of taking Phil. 2:6–11 entirely out of its connection, and letting it outweigh and even displace the Christ and the Christian ideal of Paul's letters from beginning to end. Wrede's book is built upon the foundation of this one passage, and could not have been written without it; yet one has only to preface that passage with the verses that precede it in order to find his view directly contradicted. There is no room for these verses in Wrede's Paul; yet to these verses Paul's letters are literally full of parallels, while to verses 6–11 there is no parallel except II Cor. 8:9, and there the heavenly being is robbed of all the qualities that serve Wrede's purpose, and is clothed with the character of Jesus, which Wrede affirms had no influence whatever upon Paul. Paul, he insists, found no importance in the ethical and religious value of Christ's person or life, but only in his abnegation of his divine existence. In the earthly life nothing but the death was important, and that was not a moral deed, not even a truly historical fact, but an act of God transcending history. In Wrede's view the difference that separates Christ from men, according to Paul, is a metaphysical difference; Jesus is substantially a divine being. But in truth the difference that distinguishes Christ in Paul is moral and personal, and as such is one that overcomes itself. It becomes like the difference that separates those who are in Christ from other men, a difference which it was Christ's purpose, and should be our life work, to remove. Of all this Wrede will know nothing.

---

*It was chiefly because of the three Christological verses that Colossians was judged by Baur to be un-Pauline. Others followed him, recently Reitzenstein, and, with hesitation, Schweitzer. But some have regarded as later additions the sentences that seemed to them un-Pauline. Thus von Soden at first omitted 1 : 15–20, 2 : 10, 15, 18, but finally regarded only 1 : 16^c–17 as interpolated. In the most recent commentary, that of Lohmeyer, in the Meyer series, 1930, the genuineness of the three Logos verses is maintained, but their strangeness is fully recognized. The phrases, he says, are not Paul's own, but seem in sound and meaning to come from a psalm of praise of the transcendent Messiah of early Hellenistic Christians. Important as these utterances were to Paul, they do not breathe the spirit of his thinking and faith; and Lohmeyer goes so far as to say that they actually contradict his belief, since Christ's reconciliation of the world (v. 20) means that the world does not already exist in him (vv. 16^c–17). To Paul the world is not already a unity because it was created by Christ and exists in him, but its unity is to be the final effect of the work of Christ. Paul is forced, as if against his will, to put these two contrary views side by side only in order to contradict the Colossian "philosophy" of the "elements" in which the world exists. Lohmeyer confesses that it is doubtful whether Paul was conscious of the theological significance of the function of Christ as creator; yet insists that the kernel of his thought is that creation and redemption are two functions of one and the same being. Lohmeyer's argument as a whole confirms me in the conviction that it was not Paul, but some one to whom the cosmic Logos Christology had value and truth, to whom its presence here is due.

In a recent volume of New Testament Studies there is an important essay by a well-known New Testament scholar, Windisch, on "The Divine Wisdom of the Jews and the Pauline Christology."* The problem which Windisch is interested in explaining is the strange union in Paul's Christology of the conception of the Messiah and that of the divine Wisdom, through which God created the world. He finds that "one can designate the Christ of Paul precisely as the divine Wisdom of the Jews," and that "with this the Christology of Paul is essentially explained." It is explained, perhaps, if the only thing that needs explanation in Paul's Christology is the idea that Christ created the world. There is another problem which Windisch himself states but for which he attempts no explanation, the problem of "the powerful personal feeling in Paul's thought about Jesus." The problem which he does explain is treated entirely apart from any influence whatever from Jesus himself; and that which completely takes his place is "a complex of Jewish, Hellenistic theologumena." The ultimate explanation which Windisch offers rests solely on the basis of the three Logos verses of Colossians. His article is as completely dependent on this brief passage as is Wrede's book on the hymn in Philippians. Without those three verses Windisch's article could not have been written. He deals with these verses without regard to those that follow, as Wrede deals with the hymn without regard to the verses that precede. Windisch, of course, like Wrede, quotes other passages, but interprets them in the light of this solitary one. Wrede explains Paul's Christ by the mythological figure, and Windisch by the philosophical conception. Wrede definitely excludes Jesus himself from Paul's Christ; Windisch explains his Christology wholly, without taking Jesus into account.

**Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici.* Leipzig, 1914, pp. 220–234.

I shall not expect that all others will necessarily share my doubts about Paul's authorship of these two classical passages on Christology, but I do feel justified in claiming that their significance for Paul is not to be found in themselves alone. We have no right to take them out of their connection and then draw out of them all the logical consequences which seem to us to be involved in them, and to regard the results as the Christology of Paul. If we assume the Pauline authorship of both of them, the hymn in Philippians should be understood in accordance with the three passages which have, as we have seen, a peculiar right to interpret Paul's use of it. The hymn taken by itself contradicts our two primary tests of Paul's teaching, that he subjected his thoughts about Christ to Jesus himself, and that he meant to say about Christ only what the Christian can experience as in a real sense his own, and therefore can understand. But the three passages are all in striking agreement with these characteristics of Paul; and it is a fair inference that he meant the hymn to be interpreted in the same sense. So the Logos verses of Colossians, if they are Paul's, do not thereby lose their right to be interpreted by Paul. We are not justified in finding the meaning of this picture of Christ solely in the Wisdom of Solomon, or in Philo. If this brief but extraordinary passage was Paul's own, it must have been consistent with the rest of the letter, especially with what immediately follows it, and presumably not wholly out of accord with his other letters, especially those that come from the same period.

It is surely according to Paul to say that Christologies should consist not in explanations of the nature of Christ in a sense in which it is impossible for us to explain and understand even our own natures, but in efforts to give expression to that which Christ is to the Christian's faith and as the Christian's new self. One's Christology should tell what the Christian religion as religion, not as science or philosophy, means by "knowing Christ." With any such conception of what thinking about Christ is, Paul's account of himself in the third chapter of Philippians, and his account of the Christian in the third chapter of Colossians, are vastly more important in their Christological significance than the two famous Christological passages. To use these passages not only without attention to those that follow, but in such a way that there is no place for these in the thought of Paul, is to cut Paul's Christology entirely off from that which Paul himself calls his knowledge of Christ. I do therefore feel it right to urge that we discover Paul's Christ first by studying Colossians without the three verses, and Philippians without the six, and then look for the most probable explanation of the presence of these verses, which in each letter stand quite by themselves.

4. JESUS CHRIST IS LORD

The Philippian hymn raises an important question which we have now to consider. The hymn culminates in God's enthronement of Christ as Lord; and Christ's lordship is described in terms that would seem to have no possible application to men, that are indeed in part taken from one of the greatest self-assertions of God which the Old Testament contains (Isaiah 45:21–25). The universal and exclusive worship which God there claimed for himself alone he has now given to Christ. The name Lord seems here to carry with it almost all that is involved in its use in the Greek Old Testament, where it stands in the place of Jehovah (Yahweh), the God of Israel, but with the reservation contained in the final words, "to the glory of God the Father." Our question, then, is whether the title, Lord, itself does not contradict our tests of Paul's Christian thinking? Is not this the supremely separating name of Christ?

Paul certainly accepted the formula "Jesus Christ is Lord" as the fundamental Christian confession of faith (Romans 10:9). What then did the title, Lord, mean to Paul? Does it not involve a contradiction of the principle that what is said of Christ must have truth and reality in the Christian's own experience? In the hymn Paul's doctrine of the Christian is entirely lacking. There is in it no hint, indeed there seems no possibility, that men are to share the title of Christ and the power and glory that belong to it. The writer of the hymn no doubt intended to separate Christ absolutely and finally from men. The exaltation of Christ to this Godlike name and place was due not only to the self-sacrifice and humility of his earthly life, which men should imitate, but also to the fact that his primary act of self-denial was that of a divine, not a human, being; that his earthly life was not really human; and that now the attitude of human beings toward him as Lord can be only that of submission and worship. But does this mean that we are mistaken about Paul, or is it only the final proof that the hymn is not his?

The confession, Jesus is Lord, was not Paul's own, but belonged beyond doubt to the Christianity which he "received." But it seems to have become so familiar a title that it was already coming to be, like the original title Christ, a part of the proper name of Jesus. By "the Lord" Paul means Jesus Christ, and does not always seem also to mean a Christology.

There is a division of opinion among scholars, centring about the important work of Bousset,* on the question whether this title, which seems to have been the fundamental confession of faith in the Pauline communities, was Aramaic or Greek in its origin, whether first the confession of the primitive Palestinian church, as the prayer, "Maranatha," seems to indicate (I Cor. 16:22), or of the earliest Hellenistic Christianity. Into that question it is not possible for us here to enter. For our present purpose a more important question is whether Paul understood the confession to mean that Jesus is to be interpreted by Lord, or that Lord is to be interpreted by Jesus. Did the confession mean to him, Jesus is Lord, or, the Lord is Jesus? Did Paul subject the name Lord to Jesus himself? The writer of the hymn did not. To him the earthly life of Jesus was a voluntary renunciation of his real nature, a self-emptying, a slavery, which was the extreme opposite of that lordship which God gave him in compensation. But of Paul we should expect something different from this. If he subjected the name Lord to Jesus, he would understand it to express the divine greatness and power of humility and love themselves, not to be given as their counterbalancing reward.

It is true that if the confession, Jesus is Lord, belonged to primitive Christianity, the transition from Aramaic to Greek would have brought with it the strange result that Greek Christians would call Jesus by the name which in their sacred scriptures, the Greek Old Testament, translated, or rather was substituted for, the proper name of Israel's God, Yahweh. It is a very difficult question what influence this which was the most important difference between the Hebrew and the Greek Old Testaments had on

**Kyrios Christos,* 1913, 2d ed., 1921.

the thinking of early Hellenistic Christians about Christ, especially on the currency and meaning of the name Lord. Those who called Jesus Lord would inevitably apply to him Old Testament language about Jehovah whenever the language seemed appropriate to Jesus. So it seemed right to the author of the hymn to apply what was said of Jehovah to the exalted Christ; and there are instances of Paul's own use of Old Testament passages in the same way (*e. g.,* I Cor. 1:31, 2:16, 10:22; Romans 10:13). So far as Paul does this it is without any confusion between God and Christ, or any inference that the Christian was to understand Christ wherever the Old Testament used the word Lord. "God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" is the familiar phrase at the beginning and end of his letters, and in it difference and likeness between God and Christ are both expressed. Paul does not seem to feel the difficulty which is unescapable to us, and never discusses or defines the relation between the likeness and the difference which such phrases involve.

In Phil. 3:20–21 we find the thoroughly Pauline idea that the power which Christ possesses and exercises, which in the hymn is described as his lordship, is indeed the power that subjects all things unto himself, not, however, by making all slaves to him who is the Lord, but by making all like himself. His power as Lord is seen in the fact that he will transform even our earthly bodies so that they will have the same form as his glorified body. The outward and as it were physical difference that remains between the heavenly Christ and his earthly disciples will be removed. So the lordship of Christ seems to mean, at its highest, the power to lift others up to its own level. It is the lordship of love, which can hold nothing for itself, but must share its all with others, even its fully divine power and glory. There could be nothing more Pauline than this. It would seem to mean that Paul does interpret even the name Lord by Jesus himself, and think of it as the designation of one who is indeed always first, but who wills not to remain apart and alone.

When therefore Paul tells the parallel drama of his own Christian life, and summons others to follow him, it is not with the promise that outward rewards and high place in the world to come will recompense them for present outward renunciations and sufferings, but with the assurance that to the lowliness of a love like Christ's belongs a greatness also like his. So in that other longer autobiography of Paul, to which we have already given attention, his ruling thought is that the seeming weakness of the humility and self-sacrifice of love is itself the power of God (II Cor. 11: 16–12: 10, 13: 3–4). So the faith that Jesus is Lord would mean that Lord is to be understood according to Jesus, that the humility and self-denying love of the earthly life of Jesus are themselves the nature of the supreme power and ultimate reality of the universe.

In the hymn to Christ as Lord we have the characteristic apocalyptic motive: those who are weak and despised in this world will be great and have rule in the world to come. But Jesus himself had said: "Ye know that they who are thought to rule over the heathen lord it over them . . . but it is not so among you; but he who wishes to become great among you shall be your servant, and he who wishes to be first among you shall be slave of all." Paul knew that the lordship to which Jesus had attained was the new lordship whose nature he had discovered and revealed. If Lord is to be understood according to Jesus it can no longer mean the outward subjection of others and authority over them; it can no longer mean the essential separation of Christ from men. There is in this, in principle, the subjection to Jesus himself of apocalyptical hopes and of the meaning of kingship, and so of Messiah and of Lord; and this in spite of Paul's acceptance from primitive Christianity of the expectation that Christians with Christ were to be heirs of the Jewish hope of rulership over the world. It is in reality a transfigured rulership if Jesus is first and head in it.

That Paul really did subject the title Lord to Jesus himself, and so give it a meaning which has its truth for the Christian as well as for Christ, is remarkably demonstrated in the third chapter of II Corinthians. We have seen how Paul here contrasts the old order with the new. Let us see now what the great sentence, "The Lord is the Spirit," means for Paul's Christology. The Lord of the old covenant, Paul has been saying, had a glory, but it was a glory which separated him from men. No man could approach or look upon that glory except Moses; and the reflection of that glory in his face was such that even at him the people could not bear to look. It separated him from them as if for the time he were a divine being. He must veil his face from them, and only remove the veil when the light had faded, or when he entered again into the presence of the Lord. The glory of the Lord meant his separation from men. Such was the glory with which the religion of Law, written on stones, had been given.

But the glory of the Lord of the new religion, not of the letter, but of the spirit, though it is far greater, is of a different nature. "The Lord is the Spirit; but where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all, with unveiled face, mirroring the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as from the Lord-Spirit."

This, then, is a glory that all men may look upon, and with unveiled faces. In the faces of all men the glory of this Lord is reflected, but the reflection is of such a nature that it does not fade away; instead, it increases until it becomes the transformation of those who experience it into the likeness of the Lord himself. The glory of the Lord becomes the glory of those who look upon it. The name Lord, in this new dispensation, does not separate the one who bears it from others; his glory does not dazzle and even destroy men, as the glory of the Lord of the old religion did. The lordship of Christ does not mean that men must be his slaves; on the contrary its first effect is freedom; first, freedom, and then likeness. It is these two effects of the lordship of Jesus that are expressed by adding the word spirit to the word Lord. The Lord Jesus is the spirit; and therefore his lordship and its glory become a like glory and a like lordship in all men who turn to him.

So Paul conceives that Jesus has subjected even the name Lord to himself. The very power and rulership which it expresses are seen to be not the power that enslaves, but the power that sets free; and the glory is not a glory that separates the divine from the human, but a glory that transforms the human into the image and nature of the divine. There is no veil, and there is no fear.

This spiritualizing, in the most literal sense of the word, which is involved in Paul's great sentence, "The Lord is the

Spirit," does not mean a lowering, because a humanizing, of the nature or place of Christ. Paul will still go on to say, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves your slaves because of Jesus." Paul will call himself not only the slave of men, but also the slave of the Lord Jesus Christ, and yet declare that he is free from all men, and that it is Christ who has set him free from the real slavery under which men groan, the slavery to law, to sin, and to death (II Cor. 4:5; I Cor. 9:1–2; Romans 8:2). "The Lord is the Spirit," with Paul's interpretation of its significance, is a saying which fully justifies us in affirming that Paul does not allow even the name Lord to separate Jesus from us, and that even of that name it is according to Paul to say that the Christian finds its meaning within, and knows it in his own experience. The glory of that Lord who is Jesus Christ, the Lord who is Spirit, is a glory that imparts itself and becomes the glory of all who look upon it.

What can Bousset say to this most extraordinary of Paul's sayings about the name Lord? Paul's Christian piety, he affirms, rested on the fundamental faith of Hellenistic Christianity that Jesus Christ is Lord; but there was something new in his use of this confession. There was in Paul a peculiar intensity of personal feeling toward the Lord Jesus Christ, a sense of belonging completely to him. "With glowing passion Paul embraced the Lord Christ as the present living one who ruled his entire life." When he calls himself the slave of this Lord he is not thinking only, or chiefly, of a cultus relationship, but feels that this Lord is a present power, in whose service he puts his whole personal life. To understand how Paul conceived of the Lord as the ruling element in his life we must take our start from a conception that dominates his thinking. *"Paul's faith in Christ is essentially comprehended in one sentence, 'The Lord is the Spirit.'"* In this, Bousset affirms, consists the peculiarity and characteristic of Paul's Christology, that he identifies the Lord Christ with the supernatural spirit, not indeed completely, yet so that there is no essential difference between them.

But he strangely goes on, in agreement with Wrede, to assert that Paul's Lord Jesus Christ has no real relation whatever to the historical Jesus. It is the exalted heavenly Christ alone whom Paul loves and serves as Lord; it is, after all, the Lord of the cultus, the one who is worshipped in the services of the Christian church. Here Bousset is surely attempting the impossible. He would explain what he calls the peculiar characteristic of Paul's Christianity, the intensity of his personal feeling toward Jesus, the inwardness of his experience of this Lord as the present ruling element in his life, while denying any real personality in the object of this glowing personal devotion. Bousset sees the problem, but does not offer a solution in place of the natural one, which he excludes, that it is due to Paul's seeing in Jesus himself the Lord of Christian faith and worship.

If we would know whether Paul's conception of the Lord who is spirit was influenced by Jesus himself, we should ask what effects Paul found resulting in himself and in others from the Lord-Spirit when he became the ruling element in the Christian life. But any such search would inevitably lead us in the direction of Jesus himself, and would make it impossible to exclude him. Even when we interpret "the Lord is the Spirit" by what immediately follows as a consequence we are well on our way toward Jesus; for the giving of freedom and the imparting of his own image, his own glory, to all who look upon him, are not the natural understanding of lordship, but are precisely that reversal of what Lord naturally means which Jesus alone exemplified and achieved.

The striking assertion that Paul's faith in Christ is essentially comprised in the one sentence, "the Lord is the Spirit," is italicized in the first edition of Bousset's book, but disappears entirely in the quite radical revision of the chapter on Paul in his second edition. It is as if he felt that he had said too much. Now he says only that since Lord and Spirit both describe the divine power present and manifesting itself in manifold marvels, in the worshipping congregation, it is not strange that Paul began to fuse them into one, and came finally to the expression, "the Lord is the Spirit." This is to limit unwarrantably the meaning of both words and naturally to lessen the significance of their identification. In truth the great saying, "The Lord is the Spirit" is due to just that which Bousset excludes, to the subjection of the name Lord to Jesus himself. There was danger, as with every Christological formula, so with the confession, "Jesus is Lord," that Jesus himself would be interpreted and in the end displaced by the great name with its traditional meanings. We have found Paul recognizing the danger in the hymn to Christ as Lord, which he quotes in Philippians. Here in Corinthians he guards against it in a different way. In the new religion the Lord is Jesus, and therefore the nature of lordship itself is transformed. The Lord is the Spirit; the name that most separates Christ from men is joined to the word that most unites them, and lordship itself, with the freedom and glory that naturally belong to the Lord alone, is given to all and created in all who will receive it. Christ is both above and within, and is the same in both aspects and functions. It is only toward the Lord who is Jesus, but quite naturally toward him, that Paul had the intense personal feeling which Bousset notices as the new note in his piety, but does not explain.

Paul puts Lord and Spirit together more than once. "No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit" is a sentence that tempts and rewards reflection (I Cor. 12:3). Only those in whom is the Spirit of God can see the divine greatness and glory of Jesus. He is not Lord, but quite the opposite, to the minds of ordinary men. It is the same truth which Paul dwells upon in I Cor. 2:6–16, ending, "Who hath known the mind of the Lord (Isaiah 40:13) . . . but we have the mind of Christ." And again, "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit" (I Cor. 6:17). These are two of Paul's striking Christian supplements to Old Testament texts. In the second one he quotes, in regard to man and woman, "they shall be one flesh" (Gen. 2:24), and adds that the Christian, who belongs wholly, body and all, to the Lord, is married as it were to him, but as one spirit. Paul does not think of Lord as the word for transcendence, for the "Wholly Other," while spirit means immanence. These are not the names of two Christs, one in heaven on the throne of God, and the other in the Christian as his new self. To be at home with the Lord, in the final sense, does indeed require absence from the body; but one need not wait for death before he can live "in the Lord."

This last phrase is the most remarkable evidence that Paul has really subjected the name Lord to Jesus himself. The phrase "in Christ" seems to be original with Paul. It is his subjection to Jesus of the familiar expression "in the spirit"; and his common use of it expresses his feeling that in all that the Christian thinks and feels and does he wholly belongs to Christ and is bound up in living oneness with him. Paul writes "in Christ Jesus" thirty-nine times, and "in Christ" thirty-four; but he uses also "in the Lord" fifty times, with equal freedom and with precisely the same meanings. This is the most striking proof that to Paul the Lord is none other than Jesus himself, and that "the Lord is the Spirit" was not a momentary bold paradox, but was an expression of Paul's most natural way of thinking.

What "in the Lord" meant to him, and especially that it did not mean immersion in an attenuated substance, but an intimate personal relation to the person Jesus Christ, a oneness of love with him, becomes unmistakably evident when we mark the effects in spirit and conduct which are characterized or explained in Paul's actual uses of that phrase. They are qualities of Jesus himself. The Christian knows that he is in Christ, in the Lord, when he is like Jesus in mind and in deed. Even Bousset has to confess that in comparison with "in spirit" Paul's "in Christ" has a certain personal quality; but he insists that "one understands the 'in Christ' of Paul falsely if he thinks in any way of the historical Jesus in our sense"; "Paul's Lord Christ stands only in a loose connection, if in any, to this Jesus of Nazareth." He says this in spite of the fact that he has on his hands the unsolved problem of accounting for the intensely personal feeling that distinguishes Paul's attitude toward the Lord Christ, the feeling of belonging to him, and being completely bound to him in spiritual oneness of life. "None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's" (Romans 14:7–8). "Whatsoever ye do, work heartily, as unto the Lord, and not unto men. . . . Ye serve the Lord Christ" (Col. 3:23–24).

Paul no doubt thought of the lordship of Jesus as beginning only after his death. In this he would have agreed with the hymn which he quoted, and with the primitive belief of which there is evidence in Acts 2:36, "God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified." It is apparent in the saying, "To this end Christ died and lived, that he might have lordship over both dead and living" (Romans 14:9); and is clearly implied elsewhere (I Cor. 15:20–28; Col. 1:18 ff.; Eph. 1:19 ff.). But this suggests our next question, whether Christ's resurrection itself does not involve a separation from us such as sets bounds to the principle that what is true of Christ must have truth for the Christian and so be verifiable in his inner experience.

5. THE SECOND MAN OF HEAVEN

"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" When Paul uttered that challenging question he thought first of the persecutions and sufferings which the confession and the following of Christ involved. Then he rose, as he likes to do, from the particular to the universal, and exclaimed that nothing in the universe can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord; no powers, not even death, no events, present or future, no height and no depth; for the love of Christ is the love of God which is in

Christ; it has the power of God, but it is the person Jesus Christ. There is no better text for our general study of Paul's thinking about Christ than this. It includes the two controlling principles, that his thinking is according to Jesus, and that it is according to the Christian. No thought about Christ can have a place in Paul's Christianity if it tends to separate us from his love. When names or definitions of his place and nature threatened to displace him, or to become barriers between him and us, Paul either set them aside or found a way of interpreting them so they would apply to Christians also, and could be verified in the Christian's own experience, which is indeed fundamentally nothing but the experience of his oneness with Christ. Nothing is Christian which separates us from him.

This text is peculiarly fitting as a key to Paul's thoughts about the risen and heavenly Christ, since death as well as life, and the future as well as the present, are included among the things which Paul is persuaded cannot separate us from Christ. The first impression might well be that the death and resurrection of Christ, his heavenly life and his expected coming and reign, do separate him absolutely from all other beings in the universe. We have found Paul assuming that what Christ is to the Christian faith and in the Christian experience he became because of his earthly life and through his death and resurrection. But if by these he was removed from this world and elevated to a position of heavenly glory, how could this mean anything but the widest separation of him from us? It would seem to be just his resurrection which removed him completely from earth and from men. In fact the functions ascribed to the apocalyptical Christ and the character in which he was conceived were commonly such as must call forth awe and fear rather than love. Love to Christ is not the piety of the Book of Revelation.

It is to the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians that we must look in order to discover how in fact the apocalyptical conceptions, which Paul shared with other Christians, affected his thinking about Christ, and whether he could control them by Jesus himself, and bring them into accord with the Christian's experience of oneness with him in love. We have already looked here for light on Paul's thinking about the future life, but the chapter is also one of great importance in its bearing on his thoughts about Christ.

By his death and resurrection Christ was separated from his disciples. Paul was one whose Christianity consisted not in the worship of the separation itself, but in the experience of nearness. He must find ways in which to overcome the separation. One of his ways led toward the future. The separation is temporary. Christ was the first to rise from the dead; but God who raised him out of death will raise us up also to be with him. Another way pointed inward. The separation even now is not real. It can be overcome, for it is possible now to die and rise with Christ and to live with him and in him. The present inward dying and rising is the anticipation of the future outward rising from death; and the fellowship with Christ which the present dying and rising with him effects is no less real than that for which we hope, and is indeed of the same essential nature, that of personal communion and love. It is with the first of these two ways, the way of hope, that Paul deals almost exclusively in the chapter to which we now turn.

We may perhaps infer from the course and tone of Paul's argument here that there were Corinthian Christians who, though they did not question the resurrection of Christ—they could hardly be Christians and deny that—yet regarded his resurrection as entirely exceptional, and for all other men preferred to hold to the best tradition of Greek thought about life after death, to Plato's doctrine of the immortality of the soul. The gospel stories of the resurrection of Jesus disclose the tendency to make it increasingly unique by emphasizing its physical aspects and regarding it as the miracle of miracles. Paul saw a serious danger in this tendency to separate Christ from Christians. Nothing is more remarkable in this great chapter throughout than the consistency and emphasis with which he insists on the identity of the experience of the Christian with that of Christ in the matter of life after death. He begins, of course, with a narrative of the appearances of Christ; but in it all physical features are absent. The witnesses to the fact that Jesus lived after death are enumerated, from Peter, the first, to Paul himself, the last; but in every case Paul repeats the one simple word, "he was seen," and beyond that says nothing to describe or explain the nature of the experience. But when he comes to the question, "How are the dead raised?" and answers it by his strange phrase, "spiritual body," we know as well as Paul could tell us how he conceived of the Christ who was seen by Peter and the rest, and by himself; for as the dead are raised, so was Christ raised. His resurrection, therefore, was not of flesh and blood; about that Paul is emphatic. It was a bodily resurrection, since otherwise he could not have been seen, but it was a body of a wholly new and different nature from that which died and was buried, as different as heaven from earth.

In the verses that follow (12–19), Paul argues directly against any uniqueness in Christ's life after death. Those who deny resurrection in general, and this would include those who say that it is only the soul that survives death, thereby deny the resurrection of Christ. "If there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised." Paul repeats this with strong emphasis. To think of Christ's life after death as different from what ours could be would mean to deny it, and to reject the testimony of those who declared that he was seen by them. "But now hath Christ been raised from the dead," Paul confidently exclaims, and not in a way peculiar to himself, but as "the first fruits of them that are asleep." His resurrection was not his alone, but has the same universal consequence as Adam's death. "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." Then follows the great, though so brief, sketch of the life of the heavenly Christ, with its three decisive events: his resurrection; his Parousia, with the resurrection of Christians; and "the end." We shall come back to this remarkable passage when we can bring to its interpretation Paul's discussion of the nature of resurrection and the nature of the risen Christ; and to this we must now turn (vv. 35–49).

"Some one will say"—some Greek no doubt, to whom resurrection seemed a foolish fancy—"How are the dead raised? and with what sort of body do they come?" Paul replies by an exposition of his conception of the risen body, of heavenly nature, in its absolute distinction from the earthly body in its weakness and mortality. His argument does not appeal to anything peculiar in the nature of Christ. He appeals to analogies in the nature of things, and to what it seems reasonable to think about the future life. His assumption throughout is that resurrection is the same thing in Christ's case as in ours, or in our case as in his. We have the right therefore to argue from either to the other, both as to its reality and as to its nature. But if Paul does not argue from the peculiar nature of Christ, neither does he argue as Plato did from the nature of the soul. He argues, as we know from other passages, from the nature of God. The resurrection of Christ was a mighty act of God; and Paul's Christian belief in life after death was nothing but the belief that he who raised up Jesus Christ from the dead will raise us up also with him (Romans 6:4, 8; I Cor. 6:14; II Cor. 4:14). In the passage before us it is the contrast between the body that is buried and the body that is raised which Paul seeks to make reasonable by analogies from nature; and this contrast he finally expresses as that between a "psychical body" and a "spiritual body" (v. 44). Both of these expressions would sound completely strange and even self-contradictory to the Greek ear. Even those who are familiar with Paul's manner of speech might well wonder why he did not describe man's present body as fleshly, *sarkical*. He justifies his choice by quoting the Old Testament definition of the nature of Adam, and by adding his own parallel but contrasted definition of the nature of Christ.

This passage in which Paul takes up again the comparison of Adam and Christ, which he had already made (v. 22), is of very great Christological significance, but it is not easy to interpret. It is important, in the first place, to understand that Paul is a Hebrew in his way of thinking. He quotes the sentence from Genesis, "The first man Adam became a living soul (psyche)," in which the word soul has its distinctive Hebrew sense. It is not as it was to the Greeks the opposite of body. It meant to the Hebrew the living man, the actual person as he is, shaped of earthly material, made alive by the breath of God. The soul is the life, the self, the person. To the Greek, death meant the separation of soul and body; and those who believed in life after death could conceive of it only as the life of the immortal soul when it has escaped the confining prison of the body. To the Hebrew the soul, that is the living man, is mortal. It is the soul that dies. The only immortality belongs to God, whose breath, or spirit, is the creator of life.

So in thinking of the mortal and the immortal it was as natural to Paul the Hebrew to contrast soul and spirit as it was to the Greek to contrast body and soul. When Paul quoted the sentence from the account of the creation of the first man, Adam, and boldly added, as if this too were canonical scripture, "The last Adam became life-giving spirit," he was simply proving his right to say that if there is a psychical body there is also a spiritual body, and that therefore resurrection is not a foolish conception, but it is those who deny that such a thing can be who are the foolish ones.

Since it is resurrection that he is defending and explaining, he can only mean that it is by resurrection that Christ became life-giving spirit. Adam is the first of all those, that is, the whole human race, whom God made to be living souls, earthly and psychical, in Adam's likeness. So Christ is the first of all those whom God will make heavenly and spiritual, after the likeness of Christ. The creation of man as living soul is proof that there is a psychical body, and the resurrection of Christ, his creation as life-giving spirit, is proof that there is a spiritual body. There can surely be no doubt about this. "The first man of earth, earthy: the second man of heaven." This does not mean that Adam pre-existed in the earth and came out of it; nor does it mean that Christ pre-existed in heaven and came from heaven to earth. The words "of earth, earthy," "of heaven," and "heavenly," describe the nature of Adam and of Christ, but also that of all who follow after them; so that those who are Christ's become thereby of heaven and heavenly in the same sense in which those words apply to him.

That it is the resurrection of Christ that corresponds in Paul's parallelism to the creation of Adam, so that it is by the resurrection that the last Adam became life-giving spirit, is so evidently involved in Paul's whole course of thought that it could hardly have been questioned by any one if it were not that the expression "the second man is of heaven" reminded some readers of the two men whom Hellenistic interpreters had found described in the two accounts, in Genesis, of the creation of man. According to Philo, the first account, "God created man in his own image" (Gen. 1:27), describes the making of the ideal man, the genus, man as he existed first in the mind of God. After the likeness of this type, God made the man of sense, shaped of the dust of the earth (Gen. 2:7). This is of course based upon the Platonic theory that all things exist primarily in the world of ideals, and that sensible objects are made after the models and in some sense by the energies of these typical and ultimate realities.

To Philo the ideal or heavenly man, of whom he believed that Moses wrote, is closely bound up with the Logos; for it is the Reason of God which first thought of man, and so created man in the thought-world, which preceded the world of sense. If one brings to the interpretation of Paul's sentence, "the second man is of heaven," the assumption that Paul accepted and probably originated the belief that Jesus was the incarnated Logos, it is no doubt a natural suggestion that Paul meant to explain the primacy and preeminence of Christ by identifying him with the primary ideal man, created after the image of God and heavenly in nature. But in truth this is not what Paul does. If he had had this conception in mind how easily he could have shaped his contrast between Christ and Adam in order to express it. He could have written: The first Adam was created in the image of God; the second Adam was shaped of earth and, receiving the breath of life from God, became a living soul. However, that was not first which was psychical, but that which was spiritual. But now the first man, who is heavenly, has come from heaven to earth in Christ as the last man, and the first of a new race of men who are to bear his image. This is exactly what many scholars have attributed to Paul (*e. g.*, Johannes Weiss).

But what Paul says is totally different from this. He makes no reference to that first account of the creation of man. There is not the slightest evidence that he is thinking of the pre-existence of Christ. He is thinking of Jesus himself as a man of a new kind, a heavenly nature, who through his life and death and resurrection has become life-giving spirit; that is, he has become one who has the divine power to impart his own heavenly nature to men, and so to become the first of a new humanity, as Adam was first of the old. It was not before the foundation of the world, but through his resurrection, of which alone Paul is here thinking, that Christ became spiritual body, personal spirit, in the sense of one who has the divine power which is creative of life.

Paul argues throughout always on the assumption that no difference of nature between Christ and man exists such as would make resurrection one thing for him and another thing for all other men. The only difference between the resurrection of Christ and our own is that his was first. If it could be conceived that Philo's heavenly man entered into the earthly life, his humanity could only be an incident in his eternal existence, and his death could only be his return to that which he was from the beginning. Heavenly and spiritual already, he would need no new act of God to make him so.

It is also strong proof that Paul had no such Greek Christology in mind that the whole chapter is aimed against Greek objections to the idea of resurrection, and that the crucial ideas of the psychical body and the spiritual body are so completely anti-Hellenistic. But more than this can be said; for we find what seems to be no less than a direct contradiction of the idea of the heavenly man in Philo's sense. Paul insists with a peculiar emphasis upon the opposite of Philo's order. "But not first the spiritual, but the psychical, then the spiritual." May we not suppose that Paul knew some such speculation as Philo's, and the strong appeal which it would naturally make to those Corinthians who valued the Stoic Logos creed, and that he meant in these words directly to contradict a Christology which put the heavenly man first and the earthly man second. If this is so, instead of having here a passage in which Paul affirms the pre-existence of Christ, we have one in which he definitely denies it, and puts in its place the resurrection as the act of God which made Christ what he is to Christian faith. If Paul had known such a Christology he must have seen that it erected an insuperable barrier between Christ and the Christian, and would make his effort to overcome the separation between them unavailing.

There is indeed a very high Christology in this passage (15:45–49), but it begins with Christ's resurrection, and it is explained on the basis of a totally un-Hellenistic conception of man. Paul writes this chapter on resurrection precisely in order to urge and to help Greek Christians to change their conception of death and of life after death in the way in which the resurrection of Christ requires. His is first, and ours must be like his. It is true that Paul opposes also the traditional Hebrew conception that resurrection is the reviving of flesh and blood. The spiritual body would no doubt be more acceptable to Greek minds than the resurrection of the flesh; but spiritual body also is a Hebrew, not a Greek, conception.

Two difficult questions remain. The first is this: Does Paul mean that Christians will be raised as "life-giving spirit," or does this apply only to Christ, and leave a remaining separation which is not to be removed between him and us? The parallel between Adam and Christ warns us against what is no doubt to us the natural answer, that only to Christ could such a nature be attributed. What the first Adam became at his creation, "living soul," is what all men become after him; we all bear the image of the earthy. So what the second Adam became at his resurrection, "life-giving spirit," should be also the nature of Christians, for they are to bear the image of the heavenly, It is impossible to speak confidently for Paul at this point without raising the second question: Where does Paul make room in this chapter for what we well know was central in his Christian thinking, that is, for the second of the two ways of escape from the separation of Christ from men brought about by his death and resurrection, his second way of holding the Christian and Christ together against the threatening danger of the apocalyptical Christology, with its centre in the other world and in the future? The second way is not developed in this chapter, but it is not excluded by it. There is a place for it, and indeed the necessity of it is evident. It is that which Paul in his writings as a whole, and in this letter also, puts in the first place and gives to it the greatest emphasis. Christians do not have to wait for their death, and their resurrection at the coming of the Lord, in order to overcome the separation which his death and resurrection brought about. There is a present resurrection following a present death, a dying and rising with Christ here and now, through which Paul knows that the separation which removes Christ from us is already overcome and a most real union with him is attained. This inner dying and rising with Christ, this sense of his dwelling within us as spirit, and even becoming one with our inmost self, Paul regarded both as a definite event by which men first become Christians, of which baptism is the symbol, and also as their daily experience, the self-denial, the suffering, and the blessedness of the love that seeks not its own. Through this dying and rising with Christ, through sharing his nature as unselfish love, the Christian comes increasingly to know him, and becomes constantly nearer and more like to him. It is the most real removal of the separation that divides Christ from us. Perhaps Paul's peculiar preference for calling this experience a dying and rising with Christ is due in a measure to his intensity of interest in overcoming the separation of Christ from us which his death and resurrection brought about. By this spiritual dying and rising with him we anticipate the outward dying and resurrection which will at last make us at home with the Lord. The same interest seems to show itself in the boldness with which Paul says that the Christian is already with Christ where he is (Col. 3: 1–3; Eph. 2: 6; Phil. 3: 20). It is in accordance with the same feeling that Paul describes his pressing forward, as toward a difficult goal, toward the knowledge of Christ, through the fellowship of his sufferings and conformity to his death (Phil. 3: 10–14).

If with these prevailing thoughts of Paul in mind we return to the chapter which has to do, not with the present and inward, but with the future bodily dying and rising, we are prepared to see the place which the present spiritual experience occupies. At Christ's coming there are "those who are Christ's" who rise and are with him in his reign (15: 23). Who then are these, and how did they come to be Christ's? Certainly Paul would say that they are the result of the work of Christ as life-giving spirit during the interval which is here left empty between his resurrection and his Parousia. The coming of Christ is not to be in the flesh as before, but in the spiritual nature in which God raised him from the dead. Christians must be raised, or transformed (vv. 50–54), since they must have the same nature as Christ's if they are to be with him and have part in his abolishing or subjecting all remaining powers of evil. Whence, then, come "those who are Christ's"? They can be only the members of that new humanity of which Christ was first; and they must be those whom Christ as life-giving spirit has already produced as men who bear his likeness. The order of events cannot be different from that which is more clearly indicated in Romans 8:1–11. Here "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" first makes men free from sin and death, makes them new men who are no longer in the flesh, but in the spirit; and then to those only in whom already dwells the spirit of Christ, or "the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead," Paul can say that God "will make alive also your mortal bodies through his spirit that dwells in you."

When Paul says, "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have born the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," he cannot mean only that men will rise in spiritual bodies, in the likeness of Christ, after the death of their psychical bodies; for it is only those who are already Christ's who rise at all. We shall have to bring Paul himself with us in order to fill in the spaces which Paul here leaves open because here his interest is in resurrection after death. Before the death and resurrection of which he is here speaking there must have taken place that dying and rising again which are the condition of one's belonging to Christ. This dying and rising must be experienced by men while still on earth, for the future resurrection from death comes only to those who have already died with Christ and risen with him to newness of life. Christ who rose as life-giving spirit is already creating his own likeness in men. Christians are already spiritual. They are no longer merely of Adam's race. The "redemption of the body" is indeed yet to come, but that image of Christ which Christians already bear is the first essential to Paul, and upon it wholly depends all hope for the future. The Christ who is life-giving spirit is not remote and inactive until his Parousia. He is certainly, according to the Christian experience of Paul, already imparting himself and making others like himself, creating a new humanity of spiritual men. As Adam made the human race, earthly and psychical, so the heavenly Christ, the spirit, is already making new men of heavenly and spiritual nature.

If, then, Paul wrote, "As we have born the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," even though his immediate reference is to our future resurrection with spiritual bodies, yet he must have had in the background of his thought the fact that those who are in this outward sense to bear the image of Christ are those, and only those, who already bear his image, because he is already within them "the spirit of life." But if we bring Paul with us, the Paul of the eighth chapter of Romans, but also the Paul of the preceding chapters of I Corinthians, we shall perhaps be inclined to find importance in the fact that only one ancient manuscript reads, "we shall bear," and that every other gives the reading, "let us bear." We may, I think, fairly decide against the ruling opinion, and accept the strongly attested text, which is also the more difficult, and for that reason the more probable. It would be like Paul, and it would be unlike a scribe, to substitute for the natural and expected future tense a form which adds a different thought, especially one that suggests our present duty, and not only God's gift through Christ. Paul would say, then, Let us remember also that we have already risen with Christ, and that bearing his image is not only our hope after death, but our present possession, dependent also upon our present choice and constant endeavor. "If we live by the spirit, by the spirit let us also walk" (Gal. 5: 25). If we have died, and have been raised with Christ, if Christ is already our life, let us live according to our new nature; "as we have borne the image of the earthy, let us also bear the image of the heavenly." Such is Paul's thought, whether he lets this hint of it escape him here or not; and in view of it we cannot think that he would hesitate to say that "life-creating spirit" describes, not only the nature of the risen Christ, but also the nature of those who now die and rise to new life in him. Spirit, in us also, as in him, is a divine power which cannot exist for itself, but must be creative of the same life in others.

In the Christology of these verses (45-49) there is nothing which has not its truth in the Christian as well as in Christ. Paul seems to intend to exclude whatever would separate us from him. As the peculiarity of Adam was that he was first, but what he was all men must be, so Christ is the first of a new humanity, and all men are to bear his image.

But can this be said also of verses 20-28? Is not the coming and reign of Christ altogether a separating conception of him? On the contrary Paul's purpose to overcome the separation of Christ from the Christian is most strikingly evident here. The coming of Christ will be his reunion with those who are his. They will be raised in a nature like his, in order to be with him in his reign, in order to reign with him, as Paul says, not indeed here, but earlier in the same letter (6: 2-3). God brings all things into subjection under the feet of Christ; but even this abolishing of all spiritual powers of evil and ruling over them does not separate Christ from Christians; for when his kingly rule has reached its height he will deliver up his kingdom to God the Father, and will himself also be subjected to him, "that God may be all in all." This is a very strange sentence at the culmination of Paul's description of the kingship of Christ. It adds peculiar weight to the evidence that Paul's thoughts about Christ do not rest upon the foundation of a divine pre-existence. No such thing as this could be said of the Logos of Col. 1:15–17. The power of the being there described could end only with the end of the universe, which exists in him. Nor would it be natural to say this of the one who was from the beginning in the form of God, a divine being, even though his elevation to lordship followed after his earthly life and death (Phil. 2:6–11). And so in fact no such thing is said in the description of his reign in the Philippian hymn; nor is it in the Book of Revelation. Such a thing could be said only of the one whose divine mission is described in Col. 1:18 ff., one whose task is not the creation of the world but the reconciliation of the beings and powers that have divided the world through their enmity. When all such powers have been overcome or have been reconciled, their enmity changed to friendship, then the one whose calling it was to create oneness in a divided world would do just what Paul here describes, he would deliver the kingdom to God, and would subject himself also to God who had given him authority for the purpose that was now accomplished.

This extraordinary conception of "the end" fits perfectly the special purpose of Paul throughout this chapter, to remove such thoughts about Christ himself as separated him from men. For here at the consummation Christ takes his place with men, not with God. The goal, "that God may be all in all," is not contradicted in Col. 3:11, for there "Christ is all and in all" when his work for men and in men is finished, when his creation in all men of "the new man, who is renewed unto knowledge, after the image of him who created him," is completed. That is an earlier stage in the reconciling work of Christ than that which is here described as bringing his future coming and reign to its end.

"Now hath Christ been raised . . . the first fruits of them that are asleep." "Since through man, death, through man also the resurrection." "The first Adam became living soul; the last Adam, life-giving spirit." "As we have borne the image of the earthy, let us also bear the image of the heavenly." "Then shall the Son also himself be subjected . . . that God may be all in all." These sentences certainly express a very high Christology. They are fitted into the apocalyptical scheme which Paul shared with his age, but they are Paul's own, controlled by his own knowledge of Christ and of the Christian experience. They have a fundamentally different character from the great Christological sayings of the Book of Revelation. Paul is on the way toward the spiritualizing of the apocalyptical conceptions. He is on his guard against their tendency to obscure the features of Jesus, and to remove him from us.

In the last of the sentences Christ is called "the Son," and to this title, elsewhere in the Corinthian letters occurring only twice (I Cor. 1:9, II Cor. 1:19), we have now to give attention.

6. THE SON AND THE SONS OF GOD

The title, Son of God, was peculiarly fitted to name the one who was Jesus himself, and who had now become the same Jesus within the Christian. This title also Paul brings into the closest relationship with the word spirit, and finds that word the greatest help in his effort both to interpret it fully by Jesus himself, and also to understand it in its truth and reality in the Christian experience. No name of Christ was better adapted to receive Paul's meaning than this; that is, none was better prepared to be understood according to Jesus, and also according to the Christian. Yet the tendency of early Christians was strong to use all titles of Jesus in such a way as to separate him from men, unaware that in doing so they were really interpreting him by these titles, instead of bringing them into subjection to him. This tendency showed its power in the use of the title Son of God; but we should not expect to find Paul responsible for the tendency, nor yielding to it.

There are remarkable discussions of the sonship of Christ as it becomes the sonship of Christians in the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans (Gal. 3:23–4:7, Romans 8). Since, apart from what is said of God's sending forth his Son, these passages concern the sonship of Christians, they are often left largely out of account even in elaborate discussions of the meaning of the title as applied to Christ. What impresses us at once in these passages is the boldness with which Paul affirms the likeness of Christians to Christ in their right to the title sons of God. Paul seems to know no bounds when he sets out to show that the sonship of the Christian is the same as the sonship of Christ. He begins the parallelism with the eternal purpose of God (Romans 8:29, Eph. 1:4–5), and does not end until the body itself becomes glorified, and Christians are co-heirs with Christ in his kingship (Gal. 4:7, Romans 8:17). Christ's sonship is first; but the very purpose of it in God's mind was that we also might become sons. "God sent forth his Son . . . that we might receive sonship." Paul goes forward in his imagination to that still future revealing of the sons of God, when those who have already experienced the spirit of sonship as a present reality shall receive the completion of their sonship, the redemption of their body, which will bring with it the deliverance of the physical creation itself into the glorious liberty of the children of God (Romans 8:18–25).

Between this beginning and this consummation, what are the qualities and experiences of that sonship which Christians receive when they receive Christ, and share with him? The first expression of the consciousness of being a son of God is the impulse and the power to call on God as "Abba," which is itself a proof that the sonship of Christians is the same as that of Jesus, since "Abba" was his own word, in his own tongue, for his inner certainty that he was a son of God. When they receive his spirit they have the right to feel as he felt toward God. Paul puts next the sense of freedom: "So that thou art no longer a slave, but a son." What the slavery was from which Christ set him free Paul explains in both epistles, most powerfully in the seventh chapter of Romans. It is the flesh, the power of sin in human nature, the bondage of having the will to do good and continuing to do evil; it is the law which enslaves because it commands but imparts no power to fulfil what is commands, but even stimulates contrary impulses; it is death, with all that that word meant to Paul. From all these "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free." But still further, "if a son, then an heir through God"; "if children, then heirs; heirs of God, but [let us not forget] coheirs of Christ [heirs in the sense in which Christ was an heir, and so] if we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him." To sonship belongs also the sense of brotherhood. All who have put on Christ are sons of God, and to them therefore there can be no Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, for all are one man in Christ (Gal. 3:26–28). To them belongs also the unfailing sense of security in the love of God in Christ (Romans 8:28–39).

The sonship of all Christians is not a shadowy imitation of that which has reality only in him. That we might receive sonship, that he might be the first among many brethren, was God's reason for conferring sonship upon him; for the sonship of Christ is of such a nature that it can be shared and cannot but be shared with others. Nor does Paul use the word "adoption" in order to make a distinction between the sonship of Christ and that of Christians. Paul does not mean by it that Christ was God's son by nature, while we become sons only by God's act, his choice and love. That "only" is most un-Pauline. To Paul, no one has a right to be called a son of God unless he is given that title by God himself. Paul could have applied the word "adoption" to Christ's sonship as well as to that of Christians. In fact "sonship" is the right translation of the word as Paul uses it. Nothing but love is the quality and power of God by which he makes men his sons. Or are we to suppose that Paul thought of Christ as the Son in some sublime yet literal sense, through some substantial process by which God produced him, and because of which he shares what we can only express by calling it the *physical* nature of divinity; while upon us God confers sonship only in a purely personal, spiritual sense, only in the sense of love? If so, then Paul fell into our easy error of making the sonship of Jesus lower than our own by trying to make it higher. Paul was much less Greek than we are, and was for that reason, but still more because of his own nature, much less liable than we to such a confusion of values as this. Certainly when Paul says that it was God's purpose that men be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first among many brethren, he meant that the many are to become sons as Jesus became a son. It is true that Paul finds the word spirit useful in his effort to mediate between the sonship of Christ and the sonship of Christians. "God sent forth the spirit of his son into our hearts." But the word serves to unite not to separate our sonship and his. Its expression in us, as in him, is the word, "Abba, Father."

What Paul says about the sonship of Christ is evidently in agreement with the two tests that it be according to Jesus, and that it be according to the Christian. Nor does Paul turn to another way of thinking, to one which separates Christ from men, when he says, "He that spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things," with what follows in Romans 8:32–39. The death of Christ was indeed an act of God's love to us, as it was also an act of the love of Christ (Gal. 2:20). But to Paul the death of Christ was not "for us" in such a sense as to separate him from us. It was above all just that supreme act of the love of Christ which we have to share, to make our own in its reality and in its significance, and that daily, if we are his.

The two "Abba" passages, therefore, not only define the sonship of Christians, but are most direct and important evidence of what Paul meant when he called Jesus the Son of God. They show how seriously Paul applies to this title the principle that nothing be said about Christ which has not its reality in the Christian's own experience, nothing which is not true of the Christ within, as well as of the Christ above. This meant to Paul that we can understand what sonship meant in the case of Jesus by knowing what the sonship is which he calls forth in us. If Paul is right, those who are really Christians have within themselves the knowledge of what sonship meant to Jesus also. It is his spirit of sonship which we receive, and to it our spirit unites itself in the witness that we are children of God. When that spirit, as our own spirit, says "Abba" to God, we know what it meant to Jesus when he used that word.

Here again the warning must be uttered that Paul is not denying some higher kind of sonship that might be affirmed of Christ in order to say of him only what the Christian can experience in himself. For to Paul the greatest thing that can be said about the sonship of Jesus is that it is of such a nature that it cannot but impart itself to all who will receive it, and create its own likeness in them. The meaning of Son of God as a title of Jesus ought not to be put into the form of assertions about him which, in time or place or in their nature, are beyond our powers to experience as our own, to verify in the only way in which such things can be verified, and to know in the only way in which they can be known.

It is in the light of these most surprising and characteristic of Paul's sayings about sonship as belonging first to Jesus, but therefore to every one who is in him, that we have to look at three passages, four verses in all, in which he seems to define the sonship of Jesus in ways that distinguish him from us. In the beginning of Romans Paul describes "the gospel of God" as "concerning his Son, who came from the seed of David according to the flesh, who was set apart as Son of God in power, according to the spirit of holiness, from the resurrection of the dead." The words arrest our attention at once because they make something essential in the conception of Christ as Son of God begin with the resurrection. Jesus seems to have been God's son when he came into being as the seed of David. What then can be the meaning of the words that follow? Our answer depends chiefly on the meaning of the verb: "declared," say the English translators, but in the margin, "Gr. *determined*"; and one asks why, if Paul's Greek means "determined," the translators substituted in the text "declared," which the Greek word does not mean, and why the Revisers left the text and the margin unchanged. The reason can only be the assumption that Paul thought of Christ as already Son of God not only before his resurrection but before he came to earth. But the word which Paul used does not suggest that God made known, through the resurrection, something that had existed long before, but that he then set bounds which had not been set before, defined or ordained something new. By this act of God, after the resurrection and in consequence of it, Christ became the Son of God in a new sense.

But in what sense? We might be tempted at first to say that Paul means what he is reported in Acts 13:33 to have said, that the day of the resurrection was that on which God said to his Anointed, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee" (Psalms 2:7). But there are difficulties in the way of supposing that the sonship of Jesus itself began, in Paul's thought, from the resurrection. That Jesus was the Son of God in his earthly life is proved by the fact that Christians in their earthly life already are God's sons; and it is made most strikingly evident by the fact that it is from the earthly Jesus that Paul quotes the word "Abba." Jesus was already conscious of being a Son of God when he called upon God as Father; but from the resurrection God has defined his place and bounds as Son of God "in power, according to the spirit of holiness." This must mean that from the resurrection Jesus was made by God to be his Son in a new and beyond doubt in a greater sense. He then became a greater Son of God; and if we ask how that could be, we can hardly go amiss if we follow the suggestions of the eighth chapter of this Epistle, and say that whereas during his earthly life he was truly God's son and God his Father, after the resurrection he received from God the right and the power to impart his sonship to others, to make all men who will receive his spirit sons of God. That would be indeed "in power," and it would be "according to the spirit," since it is when God sends forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts that we also become sons.

But because not all men would receive this spirit, it seemed to Paul that not all were able to receive it; for how could any to whom this supreme gift was offered refuse it? So he felt forced to the hard conviction that there was a determining choice of God in the matter. It must be those that love God, and that must mean those that are called and foreknown, who are also *foreordained* to be conformed to the image of his Son (Romans 8:28–30). Here is the same root-word for a determining act of God which is used of the sonship of Jesus himself in Romans 1:4,—the word which we have in *horizon*—the verb that means setting bounds, determining limits, defining, ordaining, the word which we find Paul using of himself as set apart to the gospel (Romans 1:1, Gal. 1:15), and again of all Christians, "having foreordained us unto sonship through Jesus Christ unto himself" (Eph. 1:5). When Paul says that by such a determining act of God Jesus' own place as Son of God was fixed after the resurrection, he can only mean that by that act and from that time Jesus became the Son of God in the sense in which the Christian knows him as such, and experiences the same sonship through the power of his spirit.

The verse is of the greatest significance in its bearing on Paul's thinking about Christ. It leaves us quite unable to conceive of Paul as thinking of a pre-existent eternal sonship before the earthly life of Jesus, because of the extraordinary emphasis which he puts upon the greater sonship which followed after his earthly life. He was indeed God's Son on earth, and proved it not only by calling God "Abba," but by everything that he said and did; but the greater sonship, that which it is the essence of the Christian religion to confess and to experience, did not precede the earthly; it followed after it. Son was therefore not the name of a divineness in origin and in nature which underlay the divineness of humility and love, a likeness to God in a physical or metaphysical sense which came to partial manifestation in the moral likeness of his spirit to God's. It was the divineness of his humility and love and Godlikeness in themselves, and the power which God gave him, because such was his earthly life and death, to create new men after his likeness, to impart the spirit of sonship and make many his brethren.

Two Christs are contrasted in Romans 1:3–4. They are not the pre-existent Christ and the earthly Jesus, but the earthly Jesus, son of David, and the Christ of Christian faith, who is designated by the words, "in power, according to the spirit." About everything before the earthly life these verses are entirely silent. The contrast in Paul's mind is not between a hidden, pre-existent Son of God and one who is now outwardly demonstrated and known as God's Son. It is the contrast between Jesus according to flesh, and Jesus according to the spirit, the resurrection being that which divides them. And this new sense in which Jesus became Son of God, by a new act of God, from the resurrection, is not a sense that separates him from men after he had been united with them on earth; on the contrary it is a sense that unites him with men more closely than before. According to the thought of Paul, what happened when God raised Christ from the dead was that what he had been when a man among men, he then received the power to impart to other men; what he was, he could then become in them, as his spirit became their life. It is significant that Paul distinguishes the same two stages in the sonship of Christians. They have already received sonship (8:14–17), but are still waiting and hoping for it in that fulness which only their resurrection can bring. That their sonship also will then be "in power" is certainly suggested by the effects which Paul ascribes to it in Romans 8:18–25.

When we turn finally to the two verses in which Paul speaks of God's sending forth his Son, it is with a strong but surely not a groundless presumption. We feel certain that when Paul used this phrase he did not intend to set up an essential distinction between the sonship of Jesus and the sonship of Christians. "When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law [really human, and really Jew], that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive sonship." God's purpose in sending his Son is that we may receive sonship, so that, being sons, God sends forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts crying "Abba," and we are no longer slaves but sons (Gal. 4:4–7). Does Paul mean that God sent him who was in one sense his Son in order that we might receive sonship in a different sense? If that was what he meant his language was misleading.

But how is it with the parallel words in Romans 8:3, "God, sending his own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh"? The purpose which, in Galatians, is immediately expressed, is here developed more fully in the verses that follow (Romans 8:4–17), but the culmination is the same; the proof that the purpose of God in sending forth his Son was the sonship of men is their use of the word "Abba," which only the spirit of Christ in men enables them to utter.

"In the likeness of sinful flesh" naturally reminds us of phrases in the hymn in Philippians; and it is usual to interpret the verse by the hymn, and to find in it the same conception of the incarnation of a pre-existent divine being. This is another instance of pressing the letter of a saying of Paul, and disregarding its relation to his whole course of thought. In the hymn the one who was in the form of God becomes as man, not in order that men may become like him, but that God may be exalted. But in this chapter of Romans Paul's mind is filled with the wonder of Christ's creation of his own likeness in men. He is thinking of the change which Christians experience because of Christ and in him from the power of the flesh and of sin to the freedom which is expressed by the words, spirit in contrast to flesh, life in contrast to death, son in contrast to slave. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death." In such a connection we should not expect Paul to suggest that the life of Jesus in the flesh was unreal, but rather that it was without sin. His condemnation of sin in the flesh would seem to mean that by living in the flesh but at the same time in the spirit, a real man but without sin, he passed judgment against the necessity that sin have rule in the nature of man. It need not be so; and when we see that it was not so in his case we know that it should not be so with us. But Christ could not remain merely an isolated demonstration of that possibility. His spirit can change human nature into likeness to his own, and create others also who live in the flesh, but not in the flesh of sin.

After describing Christ as sent "in the likeness of flesh of sin" Paul goes on to describe the new nature of those who are in Christ, with a freedom and variety of expression which show how well he knew the difference between words and realities, but always with the unmistakable meaning that what Christ first was the Christian is and is to be because of him. These verses, though in the form of a description of what men become when the spirit of

Christ becomes their spirit, are in reality Paul's own commentary on the meaning of "in the likeness of the flesh of sin." He describes those who are in Christ as those who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit; those who mind not the things of the flesh, but the things of the spirit; those in whom dwells the spirit of God, so that it can even be said that they are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, or that the body is dead while the spirit lives, because in them sin is dead and righteousness lives. Is there then so radical a difference between these various phrases by which Paul describes the Christian's life as in the flesh and yet not in the flesh, and that phrase, "in the likeness of flesh of sin," with which he describes the earthly life of Jesus, God's own Son? Is there a difference so radical that we have a right to say that in Christ's case Paul means son in a "metaphysical conception," one whose earthly life is not real, or not really human, while in the case of Christians he means a spiritual sonship, that of those who are sons of God because the spirit of God is in them, and they are led by it? I, at least, am fully convinced that Paul meant to make no such distinction; that he was not using "son of God" in a Greek sense, whether polytheistic, mythological, or metaphysical, when applying it to Christ, and in a Hebrew sense, as of one who is loved by God, and who loves God, when applying it to men. There is no reason to doubt that Paul would have been entirely ready to use the words, "in the likeness of flesh of sin," of Christians as he used them of Christ; just as the phrases that he does use of Christians in the verses that follow apply without change to the earthly life of Jesus.

With the words "and for sin" the case seems somewhat different. Here, whether in the sense of a sacrifice or not, the special purpose of God in the sending of Christ is referred to. These words distinguish not the nature but the calling of Christ from that of other men. Yet even with "and for sin" one has to observe great caution to avoid going further than Paul in separating Christ from men. Paul could say of the Christian just as of Christ that he died to sin and lived to God (Romans 6:10–11). We have already seen to what a surprising degree Paul requires Christians to share with Christ God's work of reconciliation and redemption. Even here Christ is first, but we are to follow where he leads the way.

The expression "in the likeness of flesh of sin" carries, therefore, no more implication of pre-existence and of the unreality of his human nature in Christ's case than is implied in Paul's use of similar phrases in the following verses to express the new nature of the Christian. That nature is still flesh, yet now no longer flesh; human, yet superior to sin and death. Against the common understanding that this verse means pre-existence and incarnation the evidence of Paul's whole course of thought is decisive. His thought centres throughout in the oneness of the Christian with Christ; and sonship is the central conception in the definition of that oneness. It is impossible that he meant to explain the sonship of Christ in this one sentence in such a way as to remove him from us in nature and make a real sharing of his sonship by us impossible; that is, in such a way as to contradict everything else that he says about sonship in this letter, in which the greatest things that he says about it are contained. If to Paul sonship means in Christ's case what it should mean in the case of every Christian, then if he thought of the pre-existence of Christ it must have been in the sense in which it has reality and carries conviction in the experience of the Christian also. The truth is, and many different lines of approach confirm it, that the region in which Paul's thought moves is first and last that of the inner life, and that in this region even what he says of Christ himself, and especially what he says of Christ, has its primary and most real meaning and value.

There is indeed a very high Christology in the eighth chapter of Romans; Paul would certainly say higher, not less high, than the sort of pre-existence which is commonly inferred from the one verse which we have been considering. There is a bold and splendid expression of his thought in words in which pre-existence is affirmed of Christians in the sense in which it applies also to Christ: "For whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren." Paul's whole mind is centred in his conviction that the Son of God does not and cannot stand alone; cannot but be the first among many sons of God.

Understood in this light the title Son of God defined, to Paul, the nature of Christ, but did not remove him from all others and leave him apart and alone. There are indeed two distinctions by which the sonship of Christ is separated from that of other men. He is first, and all others follow after him and because of him. Again, through his resurrection his sonship has become, as it were, complete. Ours still waits that completion which we can attain only as he attained it, through death and resurrection. Our bodies are not yet redeemed. In that sense, our sonship is still something for which we wait and hope, something after which also we strive (Romans 8:18–25). This is not a difference which in the end will separate Christ from the Christian. Meanwhile it is true that we already have the spirit of Christ, the spirit that cries "Abba" to God, the right already to be called sons of God, and yet that we are still "absent from the Lord" (II Cor. 5:6, 8, Phil. 1:23), and are not yet sons in the sense that includes body as well as spirit. Our religion is a hope and a faith, and not yet a sight (Romans 8:23–25, II Cor. 5:7). Paul would seem to mean that we are now to be like Christ as he was on earth, our earthly life is to be like his, only "in the *likeness* of flesh of sin"; but hereafter we shall be like him as he is with God.

It seems to me quite certain that we are not to add to these two distinctions of the sonship of Christ, neither of which makes a final separation between him and those who are his, a third which would constitute a fundamental and permanent distinction. I do not think, that is, that we are to understand the phrase about God's "having sent his own Son," or "God sent forth his Son," as meant by Paul to imply that Christ had existed as Son with God from eternity. If he had meant that, it could only have been in the sense in which all those who are to be God's sons were foreknown, and foreordained to be sons in his image. As God sent forth his Son, so he sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts making us also sons. God's spirit becomes the spirit of sonship, first in Jesus Christ, then from his resurrection, as the spirit of his Son, in us likewise.

The view that the expression, "God sent forth his Son," used twice by Paul (Gal. 4:4, Romans 8:3), implies the existence of Christ as God's Son from eternity has perhaps more easily prevailed because of the supposition that John is the best interpreter of Paul. But in the whole matter of pre-existence, the fourth gospel is of a different total way of thinking from that of Paul. To this difference belong the manner and degree in which this gospel separates Christ from Christians. Father and Son are words almost exclusively naming the relationship between God and Christ. Christians are called "children," but never "sons." Paul uses the two words without distinction. The fundamental fact in the Christian creed of John is not, as in Paul, that God raised Christ from the dead (Romans 10:9), but that the Father sent the Son; and the ruling description of God is "the Father who sent me." Such expressions occur some forty-five times. To know Christ as the Son whom the Father sent, the only Son, and the only one so sent, is to know the truth of the new religion. His work reaches its goal when it enables men to know that the Father sent him. Jesus is not described in John as the one, or the first, whom God raised from the dead. He is rather the one to whom God gave power to make alive whom he will. He alone can say, "I lay down my life that I may take it again. No one takes it from me . . . I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again" (10:17–18). This is in accordance with the self-consciousness of the Son who is also the Logos; but it is not Pauline. To Paul it is God who raises Jesus from the dead by a mighty act of power, and that act marks the beginning of all that constitutes the Christ of Christian faith. The Christ of John is himself the resurrection and the life, and approaches death with the mighty words, "I came out from the Father and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go unto the Father" (16:28).

The relation between the Christ of John and of Paul is a problem on which we cannot enter here. What has been said will perhaps justify us in not looking to John for Paul's understanding of the words, "God sent forth his Son." To Paul they seem to suggest no questions about the origin and nature of Christ. Paul seems to feel no need to account for the existence of this Son whom God sends forth, to inquire into his activities before his coming to earth, or to give any explanation of the manner of his entrance into human life. Paul, in fact, is thinking simply of Jesus himself. That God sent him was a most natural thing for a Hebrew to say of one who had so significant a place in the thought and purpose of God. Paul's eye is on ends not beginnings, on the sons of God whom this Son of God is creating by the power of his spirit.

To those of us to whom both historical and psychological studies make the Christology of John, and one might add, of Hebrews, less available for the real solution of our own problems, Paul shows a way in which spiritual realities, the spiritual nature and influence of Jesus, can find expression in spiritual words, and can call forth in us the experience of spiritual powers.

7. THE SPIRIT OF LIFE IN CHRIST JESUS

The place which Paul gives to the word spirit in his treatment of the different titles of Christ which we have been considering, suggests the final question whether that word may not itself be the most distinctive Christological term of Paul. Was Bousset right in declaring that "the Christ-faith of the apostle is comprehended essentially in one sentence, The Lord is the Spirit"? and Schmiedel in saying that "the identification of Christ with the spirit . . . is the deepest and psychologically truest expression of the Pauline Christology"? If we follow the tests that have guided us in our study of Paul's thinking about Christ, our answer will depend primarily on the question whether Paul interprets Jesus by spirit, or spirit by Jesus. If this question states a real alternative, our answer can hardly be doubtful. We have already found in Paul's treatment of the gifts of the spirit (I Cor. 12–14) convincing proof that it was Paul's purpose to bring the effects of the spirit into subjection to Jesus himself. It is his nature, that is, his love, which Paul here makes all determining. No spiritual power or effect has value unless love inspires and controls it; not even prophecy, not voluntary poverty, not even martyrdom, not knowledge, least of all "tongues." Spirit, therefore, does not interpret the nature of Christ, but the spirit is the spirit of Christ, is Christ himself, and he gives it his own character. Christ does not need to be interpreted; it is spirit that needs to be understood and controlled, and the Christian understands it according to Christ and controls it by him. Our natural inference, from Paul's remarkable discussion of the matter here, is that he would give us a Christian doctrine of spirit, rather than a spirit-doctrine of Christ. The first mark of Paul's thinking, that it is according to Jesus himself, certainly applies to Paul's treatment of spirit. Paul shares the views of his time about spirits and their activities, about the supernatural sources and character of many things, some of which call forth in us no wonder and no admiration. But that which separated Paul from the men of his time is of far greater importance than that in which he was one with them. Paul made Christ the interpreter of the meaning and value of the spiritual gifts; with the surprising result that love takes the place of all other gifts, even the highest, as that effect of the spirit of God in and through men by which its true character, that is God's own nature and purposes, can be seen.

We have seen that Paul uses the word spirit in close connection with each of the three most characteristic titles with which he expresses his thoughts about Christ; and the sentences in which he does this seem perhaps, among all his sayings about Christ, most like formal definitions. "The Lord is the Spirit" seems to be Paul's own characteristic addition to the common confession of faith, "Jesus Christ is Lord." "The last Adam became life-giving spirit" is Paul's attempt to define the nature of Christ in distinction from the definition in Genesis of the nature of man, "Man became a living soul." "Set apart as the Son of God with power, according to the spirit" defines his special calling and place, in distinction from that human nature which he shared with other men as son of David. In each of these three cases the connection of Christ with the spirit begins with his resurrection. But even more extraordinary is the fact that in each case the word spirit seems to be meant by Paul not to define and defend the separateness of Christ from other men, but to express the will and the power of Christ to impart to others all that he has and is. Spirit then is not a word that describes the distinctive nature of Christ, so that it can be called Paul's Christology, but rather helps to bring to expression his conviction of the oneness of the Christian with Christ. That the Lord is the spirit means that where he rules there is liberty not slavery, and that those who look at him are not overwhelmed by his majesty, but are changed into his likeness and receive his glory as their own. That the last Adam became life-giving spirit means that as men have borne the image of the first Adam, the earthly, they are now to bear the image of the heavenly; he becomes spirit in order that he may have power to create in others the same life that is in him. That Christ is sent forth and set apart as Son of God according to the spirit, means that, as the spirit of sonship, God will send him into the hearts of men, making them sons like himself. Because of Christ and through him the spirit of God is known and experienced in this new character, as the spirit which wills to make all men God's sons.

But this will to impart himself to men belongs to Christ's own nature as love. It is not the word spirit which adds to Christ from its own former nature the impulse to impart his highest possessions to others. That impulse belongs to the nature of Christ and is given to spirit by him. The spirit is his spirit; it is himself. Spirit is a word that Paul can use as a help in the expression of the new and difficult conception that the Lord of the new religion rules by giving freedom and a glory like his own, that the Son of God is Son in order that all men may become sons. Spirit had the meaning to the Jewish mind of God's power as it enters into men and works in and through them as God's own presence and for God's own ends in human life. When Paul identifies Christ with this spirit he is interpreting spirit by Christ. What he says of Christ as spirit is therefore in accordance not only with the first of our tests, but also with the second and third. What Christ is to the Christian, he becomes in the Christian, so that nothing is to be said of him which has not its truth and reality in the Christian's own experience; and this which Christ is to the Christian he became from the resurrection. We should not therefore expect to find in the word spirit Paul's answer to any questions of ours about the unique origin and the peculiar nature of Christ.

In two ways this provisional result may be tested. If the "Lord is the Spirit" were Paul's proper Christology, then since the Old Testament is the authoritative source of Paul's knowledge of the spirit of God, we should expect Paul to search these Scriptures in order to prove that wherever the spirit of God is introduced as a divine actor in Old Testament history, there in reality Jesus himself was already present and acting. That is, if spirit was that which Paul knew best, so that by it he would try to solve the problem of the nature of Jesus, then when he identified the two he must in effect have carried Jesus back into Old Testament history from the creation onward. We should then have in Paul a Hebrew Christology corresponding in important respects to the Logos Christology of Greek Christians; and Paul's Christ would be the mediator of God's presence and activity from the beginning.

But this is not Paul's way. It is indeed excluded by the fact that it was only after his earthly life and death that Christ became to the Christian life-giving spirit, the spirit that makes men sons of God. It was not the spirit which became Jesus, but Jesus became spirit. The well-known sentence, "Christ, the Lord who saved us, being first spirit, became flesh, and so called us" (II Clement 9), is no more Pauline than the inference from it, "So also in this flesh we shall receive our reward." There is, indeed, the short and almost casual sentence which is commonly taken to mean that Jesus was himself personally present in Israel's history: "And the rock was Christ" (I Cor. 10:4). On the basis of this alone J. Weiss says, "Wherever in the history of Israel there is an intervention of God through his angel, or through the mediating being, Wisdom or Logos, there, without further ado, Christ can step into its place"; and Windisch, "Christ as the rock already guided the Mosaic community in the wilderness." It is a very slender support for so weighty an inference. We are indeed familiar with the way in which, in the Wisdom of Solomon, the guiding presence of the Wisdom of God in Israel's history is described; and we know how Philo found his Logos active in the earliest persons and events of the Old Testament. We should not be surprised at finding something of this kind in the Book of Hebrews. But Paul has an entirely different way of proving the truth of Christ and Christianity from the Old Testament. To him Jesus Christ is first of all a historical person. His life and death and resurrection constituted a new and mighty deed of God. Since it was God's deed, it was from the beginning in God's mind; and Paul believed that he could find evidence in the Old Testament that Christ was already God's purpose, and with him the end of Israel's law and of Israel's peculiarity and prerogative. But that Christ was already personally present, so that the Old Testament religion was already in reality Christianity, was not Paul's thought. The intimations of Christianity which Paul found in the Old Testament were commonly such evidence as the story of Abraham contained that the religion of faith was more fundamental than the religion of law, and that God's purpose from the first included all men. Paul could also look for Christian meanings here and there in ways that were to him, as they are to us, plays of fancy, but were in accordance with the taste of his age, as they are not of ours. So he thinks that the Christian reader may see a prefiguring of baptism in Israel's being under the cloud and passing through the sea. But they were thus baptized not into Christ but "into Moses." And the manna from heaven and the water from the rock could mean, to the Christian, him who was to them the divinely given food and drink. But "the rock was Christ" certainly meant to Paul no more than that. His own words for such readings of Scripture are "spiritual" and "typical." His letters taken as a whole, his serious Old Testament arguments for Christianity, and his interpretation of Christ as a new act of God in history, quite exclude the supposition that he thought of the actual visible presence of Christ in this isolated and almost accidental phrase. If in Paul's thought Christ had been actually at hand and active throughout the history of Israel, then the two religions could not have been contrasted as they are in his writings. That Christ became spirit and also Lord through God's act in raising him from the dead did not mean to Paul that Christ was either the Lord, Yahweh, who was Israel's God, or the spirit through which God intervened and worked wonders in Israel's history.

There is another direction in which we should expect to find evidence if Paul were interpreting Jesus by spirit, rather than spirit by Jesus. It would be natural in that case that there would result from such an identification a less personal, if not a quite impersonal, conception of the nature and influence of Jesus. This effect has in fact been assumed by many writers. The word spirit, we are often warned, was in antiquity never free from material qualities. It was always a fluid or ethereal substance which moves through all things, and fills and vitalizes all. When therefore Paul interpreted Jesus as spirit he must have added, we are told, to the historical person, an impersonal "substantial" entity; so that he had, in effect, two Christs, the Jesus of history and the spirit of Stoic pantheism, although he did not seem to feel any inconsistency in holding them together. Now it would certainly seem to be a direct denial of this opinion also that Paul makes the spirit-nature of Christ begin with his resurrection. But there is another serious objection to it. It would certainly seem fair to say that this impersonal and material Christ-fluid or ether is proved to be un-Pauline by that most characteristic mark of his thinking about Christ, that nothing is true of him which has not its truth also in his disciples. For if when Paul called the Lord spirit he thought of that which the Wisdom of Solomon describes as the spirit of Wisdom, the underlying substance and energy of the cosmos, eternal and unchanging though the producer of all change, alone in kind although multiform in manifestation, then he would be separating him completely from all other men. Paul's whole attitude toward Christ, above all the intensity of his personal love for him, makes it impossible to believe that influences of this kind could have shaped his thinking about Christ, that at this point of all others he could have allowed a thing from without, so entirely a thing, and so completely from without, to have interpreted Christ and claimed for itself the right to stand by his side, if not to take his place, in the Christian faith and life.

But does not Paul's Christ-mysticism, which the phrases "in Christ Jesus," "in the Lord," imply, prove that Paul did become a Greek to the Greeks at this point, even if it were not his preference, but a concession, a self-denial, in order to gain the Greeks? And must we not adjust ourselves to this transformation of Jesus in the mind of Paul, even though we cannot make it our own? Certainly our liking or disliking has nothing to do with our problem of understanding Paul; but certainly also our understanding of Paul may have some rightful and even a decisive influence on our understanding of this particular phrase of his.

Deissmann's elaborate treatments of the phrase* have had the influence of putting emphasis upon the literal, local, meaning of the preposition, and therefore attributing to Paul the idea that the Christian is in Christ in a sense analogous to that in which we are in an atmosphere or ether. As we are in the air that we breathe and it is in us, so Christ is the life-element, the fluid, the ethereal substance, ethereal, but still substantial, and so essentially impersonal, in which the Christian lives, and which lives in him. With this we have a distinctly mystical conception, and the phrase "in Christ" is the evidence that is most insisted upon as proof that Paul's Christianity was a Christ-mysticism.

A detailed study of the problem presented by this phrase is not possible here, but we must take account of it as it bears on our conclusions as to the Christology of Paul. What is needed for its interpretation is a careful reading, not only of all of Paul's uses of it, but especially of the larger connections in which it occurs, and also of the many

---

***Die Neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu,"* 1892; *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul,* 1923, pp. 162 ff.; *Paul,* 2d ed., 1926, pp. 138–183, 293–299.

other words and formulas with which Paul expresses the same reality, the inner relation of the Christian to Christ. We have already looked with wonder at the freedom and variety of figures, the vividly realistic and emotionally powerful language, with which Paul expresses that relationship. It is the language not of science or philosophy, as if he were concerned to analyze and explain its nature, but of friendship, of love, language fitted to reveal the wonder and beauty of experiences whose nature is known to every human being, and is not better known by explanations.

In the great majority of the occurrences of the phrase "in Christ" we do not find the mood of mysticism, and in none of them, I believe, do we find the suggestion of a semi-physical or metaphysical process. We are not in the region of elements and their interactions, of substances and their blending; we are in the region of persons and of personal relationships. I cannot find in Paul's language any justification for the view that he had two conceptions both of God and of Christ, unadjusted because he did not see their inconsistency, that of a personal being, and that of a spiritual substance, a common, substantial element, in which God and Christ, and Christians also, can share. Deissmann insists that "in Christ Jesus" describes the relation of the Christian to Christ as a local existence in the exalted, spiritual Christ, and that there is no analogy to it in any other relationship of man to man; and he thinks it probable that the local meaning was literal, not figurative, in Paul's mind. Bousset insists that the phrase implies absolutely no reference to the historical Jesus in our sense of that term; that what we call the moral, religious personality of Jesus was of no influence and significance whatever for the piety of

Paul, and that his "in Christ" means a new life-atmosphere, it does not mean personal communion and love. It is because ideas such as these are current, and because the truth of our understanding of Paul's thinking about Christ is involved in them, that we must give some further attention to the problem of the phrase "in Christ," and the Christology implied in Paul's use of it.

Let us look first at a general characteristic of Paul's thinking which bears against the probability that he gave a local, physical meaning to the phrase "in Christ," and has importance also in regard to Paul's conception of spirit in general. Von Dobschütz has called attention to the distinction between the spatial mode of Greek thinking and the temporal characteristic of Hebrew thought.* Paul belonged to the Hebrew not the Greek type, and his thought about Christ centred in his significance as a great new deed of God in the history of man. The idea, therefore, that Paul identified him with the spirit of the early Greek physicists and of Stoicism is in itself highly improbable. Von Dobschütz quotes from Windelband's *History of Ancient Philosophy* a sentence which we may well put by the side of the contrast between Hebrew and Greek conceptions quoted earlier from Bevan and Burkitt. "The problem of Greek science was from the beginning directed to *physis,* the abiding nature of things; and this problem, arising from the desire to understand nature, so strongly influenced the formation of their ideas that the temporal course of events was always treated as something only secondary, to which no properly metaphysical interest was devoted. The inquiry

---

*"Zeit und Raum im Denken des Urchristentums." *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 1922, pp. 212–223.

after a total meaning in human history, a planful connection of historical developments, was never proposed, and still less did it occur to one of the ancient thinkers to see in that the real nature of the world." This distinction between the categories of space and time corresponds to the fundamental distinction we have been making between Greek and Hebrew Christologies. Only the Hebrew mind would be satisfied with making the significance of Jesus begin with his earthly life and death and resurrection. Only a Hebrew could see the highest conceivable greatness of Christ in the fact that he was a new and the greatest of God's acts in human history, and therefore the end of the old order and the beginning of the new. Only to a Hebrew would it seem a greater thing to say of Christ that he was the first of many brethren, than to say that he was "the only one"; and only to the Hebrew mind would he who was the first in the new world-era, just now beginning, seem greater than the first in the old world, whether the first man, or the first created being, the mediating agency, or the constituting substance and energy, through and in which all other things have their being. But the natural judgment of a Greek would be the reverse of this. He saw no such significance in time, and was expecting nothing new, but only looking for a new understanding of what is in its nature the same yesterday, to-day and forever. It was not Paul who applied these last words to Jesus Christ! It was as natural for Greek Christians to ask primarily what was the origin and eternal nature of Christ, as it was for Jewish Christians to ask what God sent him to do on earth and what he actually did, that is, what God did in and through him, in his earthly life, and through his death and resurrection. So also the Greek would think of spirit as in space, the Hebrew as in time. The Greek would ask about its nature and its unchanging place and function in the universe; the word helped his thinking about the nature of things. To the Hebrew the spirit was God's spirit, God himself as he intervenes in human history, the power of God as he works wonders in and through men. It is in particular acts of God in men that the presence of his spirit is manifest. So that the Hebrew, seeing the principal significance of the spirit in events in time, could look forward to its greatest works as still in the future. In the Messianic age the spirit of God would come upon all flesh. Time, then, is the ruling category of the Hebrew thinking even in regard to spirit. Spirit is not a space-filling substance or energy, but a divine power inspiring men to act or speak for God. It was therefore the Greek to whom spirit was inevitably material in nature, while to the Hebrew, spirit and its operations were bound up with persons and their thoughts and actions, with God himself, and with the men upon whom, from time to time, his spirit came impelling them to do superhuman deeds.

When we turn to Paul with the question whether his phrase "in Christ" means that he interprets Christ by spirit, or spirit by Christ, we have to note first of all, as a thing surprising and new in Paul, that "in Christ," or "in the spirit" applies to all Christians; not to the few among them who have the distinctly spiritual gift of vision or prophecy. Indeed it is not chiefly the ecstatics who can claim that Christ is in them, or that they are "in Christ." Paul utters energetic warnings against such claims. Men may have and exercise the most extraordinary and miraculous powers and yet not have the spirit of Christ, not be "in Christ." It is when Paul is most directly treating of the exceptional experiences which were in his time most naturally connected with the spirit and most naturally described as being "in the spirit" that he most completely subjects the word spirit to Jesus himself. When Joel predicted that in the Messianic time the spirit of God would come upon all men he was thinking of prophetic inspiration, of visions and dreams, as becoming the common possession of all Israelites. But to Paul the fact of Christ has changed all that; for if the spirit of God is Christ's spirit, is indeed Christ himself, then the meaning of spirit, the nature of spiritual effects in human life, that is the meaning of the supernatural, is transformed into likeness to him. The very fact that all Christians are "in Christ" involves in itself such a transformation. It is indeed due to the nature of Christ as the love of God that the spirit's gifts are no longer given to a favored few, but freely to all who will receive them.

A second new and if possible even more surprising characteristic of Paul's thinking is that to him the whole new self of every Christian, his attitudes of mind and feeling and all his ways, are "in Christ." The Christlikeness of the Christian in all that makes up his character and life is what "in Christ" means to Paul, it is what "in the spirit" now means. One who walks "in the spirit" is one who walks in Christ. Paul sees that the spirit of God as it works in human life is now known and experienced as the spirit of Christ, as Christ himself, and makes of every Christian one who bears Christ's image, one in whom Christ is being formed. This certainly means that Paul interpreted spirit by Christ, not Christ by spirit. In reality he put Jesus Christ himself in place of the spirit of Jewish apocalyptic, and the spirit of

Hellenistic Jewish mysticism. We rightly approach the understanding of Paul therefore not by asking what the current idea of the spirit did to Jesus when Paul brought them together, and when he put Christ in the place where spirit naturally stood, but by asking what Jesus did to the traditional idea of spirit when he took its place in Paul's thinking. Does it appear that the preposition "in" had the power to bring the whole substantial conception of spirit over and impose it upon the person Jesus? We must remember that it is Paul whose mind we are trying to understand, and to give this power to the word "in," and for its sake to lose or endanger the personality of Jesus does not seem in the least like Paul. Paul is not limited to this preposition, though he uses it often. He can say "through the spirit," and "according to the spirit," in exactly the same sense as "in the spirit" (I Cor. 12:8–9). So he can say "through Christ," "according to Christ," "with Christ," "because of Christ," even "for Christ" (II Cor. 12:10; Phil. 1:29), or use simply the dative, "to Christ" (*e. g.,* II Cor. 5:15; Romans 14:8), or the genitive, "of Christ." These various expressions describe various aspects of the Christian's relation to Christ, but they do not fit the conception of Christ as a fluid or ethereal substance. They describe a very intimate relationship, but it is the intimacy of one person with another person.

The effects of being "in Christ" are not apocalyptic or emotional ecstasies. Paul's chief anxiety about such things is to exclude such as may be due to some other spirit, hostile to Christ, not confessing him as Lord, and to restrain them, and keep them in subjection to the love of Christ, which seeks not one's own but others' good, creates order, and promotes the upbuilding of the community in the likeness of Christ.

But further it cannot I think be said that "in Christ" means such experiences of oneness with Christ as can best be described by the word mystical. Here it is necessary to make careful distinctions. We have seen that to Paul every Christian, simply as Christ's, is "in Christ"; and that he is so in all that he is and does. It is true that Paul's sense of oneness with Christ has what we almost inevitably call a mystical quality. But in this experience Paul claims nothing for himself that he does not expect every Christian to share. Moreover his being "in Christ" was not a rare and brief attainment, a loss of self-consciousness in the sense of oneness with God, such as Philo so earnestly aspired to and sometimes almost attained. Paul's Christian experience was the consciousness of being in and with Christ in all that he did and was. It involved the sort of thinking, the total attitude of mind, which Paul urges as "thinking the same thing," "having the same love"; that mind in Christ Jesus which in us creates unity and excludes faction and all self-seeking. If Paul was a mystic then we must distinguish two kinds of mysticism; one is attainable only by a few, and by them only at rare and brief moments, while the other is within the reach of all men, and has permanence so that it constitutes the actual moral and religious nature of men. Paul believed, on the basis of his own experience, that the Christian should live as having Christ with him and within him as his constant companion. He felt that the Christian's self-consciousness was always bound up with his consciousness of Christ, and that this was true whether he was in a more active or in a more receptive mood, whether he felt that he was working with Christ and suffering for Christ, or that Christ was working in and for him.

The problem of the ego in Paul's Christian experience is a difficult one; but he certainly often uses the phrase "in Christ" in a way that seems to mean, not in myself, not by my own strength, still less in my own cause. There is a "not I" which Paul has left behind, from which Christ has freed him, the "not I, but sin in me," by which Paul expressed his former slavery as one who willed the good but could not do it (Romans 7: 17, 20). That was a real inward dualism, a conflict between two selves and a sense of the weakness and failure of that which had the higher right to be his real self. The spirit of life in Christ Jesus had made him free from this conflict, from "the body of this death," the flesh which is the dominant nature of men. As a Christian Paul experienced an entirely different "not I," one that did not make a new bondage but was the liberation of man's nature from the self which enslaves: "I live no longer, I, but Christ lives in me" (Gal. 2: 20). But this is no rapture which takes him for the moment out of this life. He still lives, and even "in the flesh," but in faith, the faith which is "in Christ." The Christ who lives in him and in some sense takes the place of his real ego is, he says, "the son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me." There is no other verse in Paul which has so mystical a sound as this, but even here there is no loss of personality, no sense of absorption in the divine in some super-personal sense. The oneness which Paul describes is the oneness which unites persons who love one another.

Paul was above all a man of action. When one reads his own sketch of his life (II Cor. 11: 22 ff.) one cannot imagine him as retiring into solitude and trying by meditation to dissolve his self-consciousness into the vivid consciousness and vision of the divine. Paul had no time for such efforts. His concern was not with himself. "All things are for your sake" (II Cor. 1:6, 4:15, 12:19, 13:9). In this account of his toils and perils and sufferings there is not a breath of the spirit of asceticism. He did not choose these sufferings and hardships, still less did he inflict them upon himself. They came to him in the path of his service to his fellow-men, which was at once his calling and the natural expression of the love of Christ that was in him. The "not I" in which Paul rejoiced was the "not I" of unselfish love, not what may be only the heightened selfishness of a mystical inwardness and vision. Paul had to go back fourteen years to find a properly ecstatic experience to which he could appeal for the sake of those who valued such things. He says that he does not know whether it was in the body or apart from the body, and hardly knows whether the "man in Christ," that is simply the Christian, who had the experience was himself or not. What Paul does know and values above all other things is that one who is "in Christ" is one who is constrained by the love of Christ, one who has died to self and lives no longer to himself, one who seeks not his own. The self that has died is the selfish self, the fleshly self, to which the mind, the inner man, had been in helpless slavery. It is not one's personality which ends or is endangered in the sort of oneness with Christ which Paul experienced. The way of Jesus, that of self-denial and the cross, is not the way of annihilation or absorption in something impersonal. One who is "in Christ" is not less but more a person, is indeed to Paul the only one who has real freedom and unlimited power. "I can do all things in him who strengtheneth me."

Let us look now at two great passages in which Paul enables us to see with peculiar clearness what spirit meant to him as interpreted by Christ, why he preferred the phrase "in Christ" to "in the spirit," although he used both, as describing and explaining the Christian experience, how he thought of the relation between the apparently inconsistent expressions, "Christ in me," and "I in Christ," and why he used the later so much oftener than the former. In the eighth chapter of Romans Paul describes the nature of those who are in Christ Jesus in its absolute contrast to their nature before they belonged to him. They have been freed from their former bondage to sin and death by "the spirit of life in Christ Jesus." The word spirit defines the new life, as flesh named and accounted for their former life. The man who is in Christ is the one who has the power to do the good that he had formerly willed, but could not do. This new power Paul can call the spirit of God, the spirit of Christ, Christ, and then again, the spirit of him who raised Christ Jesus from the dead, with no apparent consciousness that his passing from one to the other requires any explanation. It is the spirit of God, it is the spirit of Christ, it is Christ himself, who has entered into the Christian and imparted righteousness and life.

This implied identification of the spirit of God with Christ might seem at first so to unite Christ with God as to separate him absolutely from all other men. To Paul however not the separation but the oneness of Christ with men is what results; and this is most strikingly evident from what follows. Those in whom is the spirit of God, who are led by it, are sons of God, since the spirit which they received is the spirit of sonship. The spirit which dwells in them is Christ. As spirit he re-creates them according to his own nature, so that they bear his name, are sons, and are even heirs of the glory that belongs to the name. They share his nature as spiritual beings. The oneness which unites Christ with the spirit of God is therefore not different in nature from the oneness of the Christian with Christ. Paul is not at all concerned here to explain the relation of the human and the divine elements in the nature of Christ. It is the nature of the Christian which he is explaining. The Christian is Christ's because the spirit of Christ is in him, because Christ is in him; and these various phrases all constitute one proof for his bold assertion, which in any obvious or physical sense is without meaning, "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit." "In the flesh" they certainly still were, in the literal sense of the word; but they were free from the old slavery to sin and death. They had the new power to please God. The old enmity was at an end. They were no longer in the flesh in the sense that sin dwelt in them, and acted in their place, making their mind, their inward man, their will to do good, powerless.

Here again, therefore, Paul's interpretation of Christ as spirit does not separate him from men, but is meant precisely to unite men with him, and to make them also, like him, men in whom the spirit of God dwells. Their experience of Christ gives them a new conception of what the spirit of God is, and of the way in which it enters into men and imparts its nature to them. The spirit of God in the Christian is the spirit of Christ, is Christ himself, and unless this is in men they are not Christ's at all.

Paul allows us here almost to follow the mental process by which he passed from having the spirit in us to having Christ in us, and also from being "in the spirit" to being "in Christ." "They that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if only the spirit of God dwell in you. But if not, if one has not the spirit of Christ, he is not his. But if Christ is in you, the body is dead . . . but the spirit life." Paul here says in effect, The spirit of God which is in you is Christ; so that to say, Ye are in the spirit, if the spirit is in you, is equivalent to saying, Ye are in Christ, if Christ is in you. If these two relationships, you in Christ, and Christ in you, were physically conceived, they would exclude each other; but as Paul thinks of them one is involved in the other; and there is, I think, a significance in the order. Christ is in the Christian, and therefore the Christian is in Christ. The chapter begins with a reference to "those that are in Christ Jesus," and the whole chapter is an explanation of the new kind of being which that "in Christ Jesus" names and explains. Paul does not write as one who is trying to define Jesus Christ as spirit so as to explain his peculiar origin and nature. When he passes from the spirit of God to the spirit of Christ, and then to Christ, and then back to the spirit of God, he does not mean either to answer our questions about the relation of Christ to the spirit of God or, on the other hand, to state that problem and leave it unanswered. The problem with which he is concerned, to which he does give what is to him a sufficient answer, is that of the nature of man, not the nature of Christ. His answer is that one who is Christ's is one who has the spirit of Christ in him, one who, having Christ in him, is therefore in Christ. When men receive

Christ they become themselves something new. Paul can express the change by saying, "I no longer live, but Christ lives in me." But it seems to mark a step further when "Christ in me" becomes "I in Christ." The "not I" becomes "I" again, "I" in freedom and power, but it is the freedom with which Christ sets free, and the power which he imparts. "Our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus." "I can do all things in him who strengtheneth me." The one in whom the spirit of God, which is Christ, dwells receives what is not himself, but then becomes a new self; if the spirit, Christ, is in him, then he is in the spirit, in Christ. "Christ in us" is the act of Christ's love for us; it is his gift of himself to us. "We in Christ" seems to follow as the expression of our answering love toward him, and with him toward our fellow-men. If Christ seems at first to have taken the place of our personality, "I no longer live," the next act is our own. We must be, as it were, in his place.

We do not need the image of atmosphere, a life-element, in order to understand how Paul could say both, "Not I, but Christ in me," and also "I, [not in myself, but] in Christ." The nature of personal relationships overcomes the apparent contradiction better than does the analogy of a fluid or atmospheric substance. The problem of the self-consciousness which is also the Christ-consciousness of the Christian, that is, the nature of the oneness of the Christian with Christ, like all the central problems that we meet in Paul, is put in its true light when it is seen to be involved in the nature of love. The contradiction is the same as that between the finding of life and the losing of it, the gaining of self by the denial of self, which belongs to the nature of love, and though it is always a paradox in its expression, is no contradiction to one who knows what love is. Nor does love find any difficulty with the conception that many may be in one, or one in many. Why is it unnatural that one should love many, or that many should love one? There is indeed a wonder in the nature of love, but it is not one which physical analogies or geometric diagrams help us to grasp. The new commandment is that we love one another. But to command love is to ask what we cannot give. Paul found that Christ gives men the capacity to become that which they see in him to be divine. If there is a secret or a mystery in Paul's phrase "in Christ Jesus" its solution is surely to be found in the nature of love. When love in one becomes a like love in the other, it is as if the persons had created themselves in each other. The eighth chapter of Romans ends with the exultant affirmation that no evil powers on earth or in heaven can separate us from the love of Christ, the love of God which is in Christ. This is the consummation of Paul's exposition of what it means to be in Christ. We are lifted up into a region where there is nothing that is perplexing, though we are filled with wonder because we are in the presence of something infinitely great.

In the seventh and eighth chapters of Romans Paul is contrasting the new capacity which men have as Christians with their natural human weakness, their inability to do the good in which the mind, the inward man, delights. To be in Christ is to have a new moral power, to share the spirit of life which is in him. It is to experience a new freedom. Christians are still men, but not in the sense that they walk according to men (I Cor. 3:3–4). That the spirit of God is in us, that is, that Christ is in us, is the primary Christian experience, it is God's act through Christ toward us. That we are in Christ is a consequence, and is in a real sense our own responsibility. All Christians should know that Christ is in them (II Cor. 13:5), without that one is not Christian (Romans 8:9). But then the Christian must press on toward likeness to Christ, toward being, by his own will and in his own nature, in Christ. "That I may gain Christ, and be found *in him*" (Phil. 3:9). If Christ is in us, then we must strive to be in him. When Paul says, "Ye are not in the flesh but in the spirit, if the spirit of God dwell in you," and goes on to interpret this to mean, Ye are not in the flesh but in Christ, if Christ is in you, he is putting before them an ideal, of which Christ has made them capable, but which they must now press on to attain. "If we live by the spirit, by the spirit let us also walk." "Be ye imitators of me, even as I am also of Christ," that is, be imitators of "my ways which are in Christ" (I Cor. 11:1, 4:16–17). The difference thus suggested between Christ in me, and I in Christ, the difference between the more receptive and the more active aspects of the Christian experience, contains, I cannot but believe, a clew to Paul's feeling in his free and varied use of the phrase "in Christ." It means indeed an endeavor in which we are not left to ourselves, in which what we achieve is not our own, and not for ourselves; but it does express a goal toward which we must press on; it is not a gift received or a miracle performed in which we are to rest.

With this clew to the meaning of Paul's "in Christ Jesus" in mind, let us turn to one of the most remarkable of his definitions of that which the phrase involves. "If any one is in Christ, a new creation: the old things have passed by; behold new things have come to be" (II Cor. 5:17). Let us leave the verse so, as Paul wrote it. "He is a new creature" is not what he said, and I think not all that he meant. The newness of the individual Christian is indeed described in the preceding verses. The love of Christ constrains him. He lives no longer to himself, but to Christ. He has a new attitude toward all men. But in the verses that follow, Paul's thought goes far beyond the newness of the one who is in Christ. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." That means indeed "a new creation" on a vast scale, old things passing, and new coming into existence. But this reconciliation, this changing the world from enmity to friendship, which God undertook in Christ, is now given to us who are in Christ, as our ministry. We are now to act "for Christ," as those through whom God is now making his appeal and carrying forward his re-creation of the world. The creation of a new and better world is made evident wherever there is a man who is in Christ; but it is true also that through such men this creation must necessarily go forward. Then Paul goes on to the remarkable characterization of Christians which we have already had before us: "In everything commending ourselves, as ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings, in pureness, in knowledge, in long suffering, in kindness, in the holy spirit, in love unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God." Here "in everything" is expanded in a list of eighteen phrases, with which I think Paul would like to have us interpret the primary "in Christ." What Paul meant by being in Christ was not existing in a Christ-atmosphere or element, it was taking upon one the task of Christ, his sufferings and sorrows, his characteristic qualities and tempers, his dependence upon the power of God, his love toward men. That we are not mistaken in taking all this as an exposition of "in Christ" is evident from the fact that among the eighteen stands the crucial expression "in the holy spirit," to which it seems clear that Paul's "in Christ" is meant to stand in a certain parallelism; but it is most decisively shown by the fact that this whole picture of those who, being in Christ, must undertake, with Christ and for him, Christ's work, God's reconciliation of the world to himself, is drawn from Christ, and has no other source. Where in this long description of those who are as it were negotiators for peace on behalf of Christ is there the remotest suggestion that "in the spirit," or "in Christ Jesus," is a local conception and imagines Christ to be a material substance?

One who is in Christ, Paul says, is not only a new man—he becomes that by what Christ does for him and in him (vv. 13–16)—but he takes his place with Christ and for him as one in whom God is re-creating the world. The one who is in Christ has Christ's work to do. He stands in the character of Christ, and as it were in his place. He belongs already to the new creation, the spiritual world; but this new creation requires such ambassadors, such ministers, to announce and to further it, as are described in this character-sketch, for men can announce it only by what they are, and can impart it only by imparting themselves. "If any one is in Christ there is a new creation." Did not Jesus mean very much the same thing when he said, "If I by the spirit of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you."

But the coming world, the new creation, consists not only of individuals who are in Christ, but it means inevitably also unity among men. The reconciliation which God has undertaken in Christ means precisely the removal of enmity not only between man and God, but between man and man. The new creation is a new humanity, in which all men are sons of God and therefore brothers in unity. Hence the extraordinary emphasis which Paul, in his admonitions, puts upon being of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind, doing nothing through faction or vainglory. Paul condemns with vehemence every divisive tendency; and he looks forward with confidence to the end of the old and seemingly impassable barriers that separate men from one another. Here, for example, are three of Paul's greatest definitions of what "in Christ" means. "Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus." "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love" (Gal. 3:26, 28, 5:6). Among the works of the flesh, "enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, parties, envyings," are more than half of the list; while all the qualities that constitute the fruit of the spirit are of the kind that create peace and goodwill (Gal. 5:19–24).

The character-sketch of II Cor. 6:3–10 is one of Paul's fullest expressions of what it means to be in Christ; and we cannot but see that it expresses not only a fact but an ideal and a duty; and that the ideal is neither ascetic nor in the usual sense mystical in character. No renunciation or denial of the world or withdrawal from it is involved. The one who is in Christ is a new man, but he is also necessarily, and in accordance with his new nature, engaged in no less a task than that of working with God toward making a new world. The experiences and the qualities of those who are responsible for this vast undertaking are those which Paul describes in this remarkable picture of those who are to be God's ambassadors for Christ. The new world will be the kind of world which men of this kind will naturally create. Is the process which goes on in them and through them in the world one that can be conceived of as taking place in a fluid or ethereal substance in space? Is it of an impersonal, that is of a physical, nature? Has it no relationship to the Jesus of history, and does it show no influence from him? These questions are certainly answered by asking them. And how is it with the further question whether what is here described as the experience and character of those who are in Christ finds any analogy in the relations of Christians to one another? Is Deissmann right in saying that "in Christ" expresses "a local finding of oneself in the pneumatic Christ," and that any analogy to this in other relations of man to man is wholly wanting? The answer to this question is given by Paul himself in the verses which immediately follow (II Cor. 6:11–13, 7:2–4). Here Paul expresses in language characteristic of him in its warmth and passion the sort of oneness between men which should belong to those who are in Christ. Is there no analogy whatever between "Ye are in our hearts to die together and to live together" and what Paul says of the oneness of the Christian with Christ? "I have you in my heart . . . I long after you all in the tender mercies of Christ Jesus," he exclaims to the Philippians; and to the Corinthians, "Ye are our epistle, written in our hearts." One must read Paul's epistles through in order to realize what it meant to Paul for one person to be united to other persons in the inner oneness of love (*e. g.,* I Thess. 2: 1–12; Gal. 4: 12–20, II Cor. 8: 16–24; Phil. 2: 1–5). If Bousset is right in saying that the new thing in Paul's Christology is the intense feeling of personally belonging to the exalted Lord and being spiritually bound up with him, then Paul's passion of loyalty and love toward men, and his constant urgency that nothing but oneness should characterize their mind and their conduct toward one another, should certainly make one hesitate to say that his "in Christ" is without analogy in the relations of Christians to each other and to other men.

"I, but not I, Christ in me" expresses then the more receptive side of the Christian's experience of Christ, what he does for us and what he becomes in us. But when Paul says "I in Christ" he means not "I no longer live," but "I live no longer to myself, but to him"; I seek no longer my own things, but the things of Christ, the things of others. It is not as if Christ had dispossessed him and were acting in his place; but he, the man who is in Christ, is acting in the character of Christ, in the strength of Christ, for Christ, and as if in his place. There is Paul's striking phrase, "I press on if I may lay hold on that for which also I was laid hold of by Christ Jesus," which means essentially that as Christ is in me, I am striving to be in Christ. There is a significant difference here between Paul and John. John frequently puts together, I in him, and he in me, as if to emphasize the mystical identity of the two phrases, which seem in their literal sense to exclude each other. Paul finds one involved in the other or resulting from it, but he does not think of them as identical. If "not I, but Christ in me" might seem to mean the loss of personality, "I in Christ" describes one who has become not less but more a distinct and significant person, one who can undertake the greatest of tasks, to whom all things are possible.

No one can fail to notice the strangely modern sound of Paul's words: "A new creation: the old things have passed by; new things have come into being." It is a perfect expression of our modern consciousness. Paul's experience and vision of this new creation meant the end of his old religion. Among the old things that had passed away were the fundamental things of his former religious faith: the law, and the distinction of Israel from all other nations and its destiny of primacy over all. It meant a new world, different from that of Paul's former hopes, not the age when Israel would rule over all other nations, bringing its high claims to their highest realization, but instead the end of its claims. For our own age, also, the new creation which science is achieving seems to many, if not necessarily to contradict religion, yet to be on the way toward taking its place, or transforming religion into something radically new. Men are proving their own capacity to overcome the evils and remove the sufferings and fears that formerly turned their minds toward God for help, and toward another world, future and heavenly, for happiness. We feel that we have reason for exclaiming: A new creation is here, and old things are passing away. The new world which we are beginning to experience, which we are creating through knowledge, is one in which new powers are put into our hands, in which above all a new humanity believes that it can bring itself into existence, increasingly greater in its qualities and powers both of body and of mind. This new world of man's creation seems to be taking the place of the old religious hope for another and better world. Our new attitude is what Professor Montague has recently called, "the new worldliness . . . based on the faith that there is not only no place for heaven, but no need for it." If there is to be a religion in this humanly sufficient pursuit of salvation, of safety and happiness and power, it would seem to be in the recognition that since man himself is a product of nature, the conquests of his reason and will prove that the power within and behind the universe is itself struggling against forces of dissipation and chaos toward ever higher forms of existence, and the coordination of all into a true cosmos, in which "all things work together for good"—for it is hard to express even such a religion in terms that are not partly borrowed from Paul. The electrons and atoms themselves seem to be striving after organic unities, or to be constrained by some purpose and plan greater than themselves toward ends of beauty and truth and goodness. Nature seems now to be presenting to men the aspect of a struggle to overcome chaos and create and maintain a world of order and rationality. The highest calling of man takes on somewhat the aspect of cooperation with the cosmic spirit in the effort to overcome evil, to make good prevail. In this aspect of it the modern mind is unexpectedly Pauline.

But what right had Paul to proclaim with all the assurance and ardor of our modern prophets, that a new creation was already at hand, that the old things were already passing by and being displaced by new? And has he anything to say about this new creation which it might be well even for us to hear?

In any one's imagination of the new world that science is to enable men to create, one thing can never be omitted. There can be no new human world of power and of happiness unless the men who make it up are men of goodwill. Of all the evils that men must conquer if the world of our hopes is to come true, the evil of fear and hatred, envy and suspicion, self-assertion and rivalry, ambition and cruelty, the evil—for all these are one—of selfishness, of lovelessness, is the worst of all and very far the hardest to destroy. We can analyze the causes of hostility between nations and between classes, but when we get back to the ultimate impulses that set men against one another, can we control them or change them from evil to good?

Paul's confident assertion that a new creation had already begun rested on his conviction that Christ was one who not only was himself free from the selfishness of common humanity, but showed the way and somehow imparted the power by which other men could share his freedom. "If anyone is in Christ"—that was his understanding of the condition upon which the new creation would arise, and when that condition was fulfilled the new creation was certain, because it was already present. If one is constrained by the love of Christ, has died with Christ and lives no longer to himself, no longer seeks his own, he is already the new creation, and is, as Christ was, with Christ and in him, the power through which it is to go forward. He also brings old things to an end and the newest of all new things into existence.

When Paul looked forward to the final result of the presence on earth of men who are in Christ, what he saw first of all was a united human community. For those who are in Christ are men between whom enmity cannot exist, and who work toward the overcoming of all enmities. They are engaged in God's work of re-creating the world by making friends of enemies, and so making peace. The new creation means the end of that fundamental difference in Paul's old faith, the difference between Jews and Gentiles (Gal. 6:15). There can be no longer Jew and Greek, Greek and barbarian, free man and slave, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, when all men are in Christ. Paul puts in opposition to these deep rooted divisions, as taking their place, as the only thing that now has significance, "faith that works itself out through love," or, "but Christ is all and in all," or, "ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus," "for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 5:6; Col. 3:11; Gal. 3:26–28).

Does science supply in our present experience and hope of a new world that which will make men use new powers for others, not for themselves, for cooperation in one human brotherhood, not for competition and superiority?

Paul of course had no remote conception that the conquest of nature's powers and the overcoming of nature's evils through men's growing knowledge and mastery would bring in a new creation; yet strange as it may seem he did think of the new creation as in the end physically new. The new men, those who are in Christ, will at last be redeemed in body also, so that they will be fully sons of God; and when this happens God will be able to remove the curse by which the present creation is subjected to the bondage of corruption (Romans 8:18–25). Though we could not expect Paul to anticipate the help that science was to give toward freeing men from the outward dangers, the sufferings and death with which their life is beset, yet when Paul ventures on his highest flight of imagination in this direction, and says that nature shall be free from its slavery when men become truly sons of God, as if only then the malign powers of disorder, deterioration and decay could be destroyed, do we not feel a thrill of sympathetic response as we realize that he has at least put things in their right order, and that he knew where the crucial point is in any sane hope for a better world. Science will go on its inevitable way toward the creation of a new outer world; but our work as scientists will never reach the goal of a united human race until we not only find ourselves one in interests, dependent on one another the world round for security and prosperity, made close neighbors by the conquest of space, but also feel ourselves to be one through sympathy and our sense of the value, the beauty, the goodness of human beings as sons of God.

Paul's Christianity, and ours, consists first of all in consent to the truth of the ideals which Jesus thought and lived. We are not his until we see with our own eyes that he was right, strange and hard to the point of the impossible though his demands and his example seem. He was new and strange, but we know nevertheless that his knowledge of man was true and that he knew the way to fulness of life. To be Christian is to see that the love of Christ is the love of God. If Paul was wrong when he repeated the ideals of Jesus, and urged that men live not to themselves, that they seek not their own, that they be at one with their fellow-men in all their thoughts and feelings, their words and deeds, if he was wrong in thinking that the highest knowledge is to know the love of Christ which passes knowledge, then we cannot learn from him what we most need in the new world that we are creating. But if kindness, humility, patience, forbearance, the love of Christ, the peace of Christ, are true ideals, then they are primary; they still come first, even in our new age, and we shall not attain a new world of real happiness without them.

It is because Paul saw that the new creation of man's hopes and dreams had the love of Christ as its beginning, its impelling motive, and its creative power, that he had the right to announce, so long before our modern announcement of it, that a new creation was taking place, that the old was passing and the new coming in. And if he were a man of our time he would certainly still say that the new world will succeed only with Christ as its head and as the spirit which gives it life. God is still in Christ reconciling the world to himself, and is still placing in us, in men who are in Christ, the word of reconciliation. It is still as true as it was then that the sort of men described in Paul's picture of those who are to be God's ministers in his creation of a new world are needed to work by the side of those who are conquering outward evils and putting outward powers into men's hands, if the new world which we are making is to be that kingdom of God which is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.

Paul was like some of our latest prophets of a new religion in that he looked to the future, not to the past, for a world in which God is all in all. God is now engaged in the task of making a better world, of creating harmony where there is discord, and it is our highest task to work with him to that end.

Paul was not interested as the Greeks were in the problem of understanding the origin and nature of the present world, nor in explaining away its evils, on the assumption that it must be somehow good; but in the creation of a new humanity he was supremely interested, and it would perhaps be hard to find in the history of great men a more notable example of one who had the vision of a new and united human society, and who set out as if single-handed to bring his vision to pass. Yet not single-handed. "I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me." It is in Christ that God himself is re-creating the world, and in Christ and with him that men can be co-workers with God to this end. So little does Paul's phrase "in Christ Jesus" separate Christ from men, and so much higher and greater is Christ in his oneness with men than in any separation from them.

Our conclusion is that the word spirit does not constitute a Christology which contradicts the ruling characteristics of Paul's thinking about Christ. Neither the word spirit nor the phrase "in Christ" is used by Paul in such ways as involve a substitution for Jesus himself of an impersonal entity, a material substance, still material however refined. Nor does the identification of Christ with the spirit of God, or the substitution of "in Christ" for "in the spirit," involve a nature in Christ which separates him from men. Paul's purpose is always the same: it is not to separate Christ from men, but to unite men with Christ. Paul knows that the oneness of the Christian with Christ cannot be expressed in words, but only in living persons, and cannot be understood except by those who experience it. He knows also that this goal is to be attained, not indeed by man's own effort alone, and never apart from Christ, always through him and in him, yet always also by men's love answering to his, and by their working together with him.*

That which separates Christ from other men is certainly not his love, though his love is the love of God, and love is that which unites him with God; for love is the very fundamental principle that overcomes separation and creates oneness. But if not love then, since that is the very nature of God, no other and lower sort of divinity can so unite

---

*A new book by Schweitzer, *"Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus,"* 1930, a book which he says brings his previous theological work to a conclusion, is an event of interest to his many readers in England and America. This is not the place for a review of the book, but a brief comparison if its views with our own may help to clarify our problems. Schweitzer argues that Paul's thinking was not Hellenistic; that therefore John is not his best interpreter; that he has much more in common with Jesus than is usually supposed, and is one who leads us to Christ, not away from him; that he was a great Christian thinker, perhaps the greatest, and that our own Christian thinking must start from him and always go back to him, and especially to his mysticism, which was his most original creation, that is to his apprehension of Christianity as the experience of communion with Christ. All this is much in the direction of our own studies. But that Paul was not Hellenistic means to Schweitzer that he was eschatological, for he must have been either wholly one or wholly the other. Eschatology is that which he has in common with Jesus. The religion of Jesus and that of Paul were through and through eschatological. We have no need and no right to add to this, in Jesus's case, religion in general, or in Paul's case, Hellenistic religion. Nevertheless Jesus and Paul did add to their eschatology a mysticism which originally did not belong to it, a Messiah-mysticism of which, after Jesus, Paul was in reality the creator; since primitive Christian eschatology looked forward only to a future communion of the Christian with Christ, while Paul's Christianity experienced that communion as present. This mysticism of Paul was not Jewish, for no mysticism was native to Judaism. "Paul was a mystic, but had not the mentality of a mystic." "Mysticism in him enters into a non-mystical world-view." But his mysticism was not Hellenistic, because it was a mysticism of resurrection, not of re-birth, and a Christ-mysticism, not a God-mysticism. Yet Schweitzer, because he will admit nothing that is not eschatological, is obliged to derive this mysticism from eschatology and to

Christ to God as to separate him from men. Certainly the word spirit cannot do so, for to Paul the supreme test of the presence and working of the spirit is that it works as love and toward love's ends. But if not spirit, then certainly not the phrase "in Christ," with which Paul expressed his subjection of spirit to Christ; for "in Christ" means nothing to Paul if not the inner personal oneness of the Christian with Christ, and the control of every Christian in all his thoughts

interpret it accordingly. The Christian's present communion with Christ is an anticipation, indeed a real beginning, of the sharing of Christ's heavenly nature. In order to make Paul's mysticism eschatological and not Hellenistic he makes it primarily physical in nature. The dying and rising of the elect with Christ makes them already supernatural beings, like Christ, no longer natural men. Christians are supernatural in a sense which Schweitzer expresses by the often repeated words, "physical" (this is Schweitzer's own approved translation of his *naturhaft*), and "corporeity." So the phrase "in Christ" means the common participation of the elect with Christ in the same corporeity, that is in that mystical body of Christ which is a physical entity. The ethical side of this relationship, the oneness of the Christian with Christ in character and at the highest in love, follows as an effect of the outward change which takes place through the outward act of baptism. Only those who are first supernatural beings through this physical, corporeal oneness with Christ are capable of love, only such can receive that love which Schweitzer also says is the greatest gift of the spirit. This is the unique sort of Christ-mysticism which Paul created for the unique and brief period between the resurrection and the coming of Christ.

I cannot believe that this is convincing as an interpretation of Paul's way of putting together the future and the present, the outward and the inward elements in his religion. Paul's mysticism is no doubt unique, and unique because it is Christ-mysticism; but its uniqueness is best characterized as personal rather than as physical, as love rather than as corporeity. It may in a sense be said that his mysticism is not that of a mystic. But that is not because he brings over into it the physical features of his conception of the world to come, but because he carries over the spiritual nature of Jesus himself, which he knows as his own new nature, into his conception of the coming world. His eschatology is transformed by his personal experience of Jesus; it is subjected to him. It is certainly nearer the and ways by Christ. What then, in the thought of Paul, does separate Christ from other men in such a way that it can be called in the proper sense his Christology? The only answer that remains would seem to be that the distinctive place of Christ was looked for by Paul in the purpose of God, and the acts by which that purpose is carried into effect. In time, not in space, Paul must have defined what was peculiar in Christ. Paul does define Christ as the one in whom and through whom God is creating a new world.

In his place in this creative act of God, which was God's

truth to say this than to say that his experience of Jesus is materialized by the belief that his coming will issue in a new external world and a new bodily nature of man, and that the primary Christian experience is the present anticipation of these coming physical events. "In Christ" does not mean in Christ's supernatural corporeity; this is as certain as that it does not mean in a Christ-ether or atmosphere. Love is the bond which unites the Christian with Christ and with his fellow-men. Love is the supernaturalness, the spirituality, of Christ and therefore of the Christian, and it is not an effect of a physical supernaturalness which must precede because it conditions it. It is one thing to say that one who has the love of Christ within him is a supernatural being, and another thing to say that one must first become supernatural in a physical, corporeal sense before he can receive the love of Christ. That the former not the latter expresses the meaning of Paul is the chief difference between our understanding of him and that of Schweitzer. We have urged it not because it is what we would prefer to have Paul mean, but because it is the natural understanding of his words. This does of course mean that eschatology is not the sum and substance of the Christianity of Paul; that Paul subjected his eschatology to his experience of Christ, and did not reverse that order. Paul interpreted the future oneness with Christ, which was the substance of his hope, by the present oneness with Christ which he knew by experience, and knew to be personal and spiritual in its nature. He did not interpret this present by a future communion with Christ, understood in accordance with his Jewish eschatology as physical and corporeal in nature. Paul did not materialize the present by finding the future already in it, but spiritualized the future by knowing its nature in his present experience of the love of Christ as the love of God.

purpose from the beginning, Christ stands first; he is the beginning; he is the head (Col. 1:18). Christ's historical coming, his life and death and resurrection, constitute the greatest of God's great acts in the history of the world. It can be compared to the creation of light, and to the creation of man; but it is greater than these, because spiritual light, the light of the knowledge of God, is greater than physical, and spiritual men are greater than Adam and those who have borne his image (II Cor. 4:6; I Cor. 15:45). But as we have seen that Paul found the Old Testament word spirit useful to him in expressing and imparting his experience of Christ only when he had subjected it to him and interpreted it by him, so also Paul could understand Christ as first in God's plan and the greatest of his acts only when he had interpreted God's purpose in the light of Christ. The newness of the fact of Christ in the thinking of Paul is in nothing more remarkable than in the fact that in the light of Christ the purpose of God is seen to be essentially different from all that Paul had thought it to be. Because of Christ he saw that God's purpose from the beginning was that the religion of law should end and the religion of faith that works through love take its place; that therefore the separateness of Israel was also to cease and give place to the oneness of all men in a unity which only love creates. Paul does not put Jesus in the place, and does not give him the character and function, which were required by the Old Testament conception of the purpose of God. If he had done that we should have from him a Christology in the proper sense of that word. But Paul interprets the purpose of God by Christ, not Christ by the purpose of God. So that even that in Paul's thinking about Christ which so definitely sets him apart from other men is so brought into subjection to him that the separation of Christ from others quite changes its aspect and reveals itself as existing only for the sake of final unity. It was not God's purpose that Christ should remain his only son, but that men should be conformed to the image of his son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. This means not only that every man's life is a plan of God, that God has a purpose, not only for Christ, but for all men; it means also that God's purpose for all is the same as his purpose for Christ. "Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus." "He chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world . . . having foreordained us unto sonship through Jesus Christ." The peculiar place of Christ in the purpose of God is of such a nature that it involves the end of the peculiarity, the end of the nation Israel's distinction from other peoples, and the end of the law which defined and defended the nation's distinction. When Christ is made the supreme thought and purpose of God, those who become new men in his image, and the new world that such new men create, each and all have their place as part of the same divine purpose. The purpose of God which seems at first to give Christ a place of absolute distinction from all other men becomes, because of what Christ actually was, and when it is understood according to him, a purpose that unites all men with Christ, that makes all men sons of God, and all one in a oneness that knows no distinction of race or class. Christ remains in the history of God's unfolding plan the beginning, the first, the head, but he is the first of many, the beginning and head of a new humanity.

To think of Christ in ways that separate him in nature either from Jesus himself or from Christians can only mean to substitute a substance for a person; or if personality is still affirmed, to substitute some other quality in him for love. Paul exalts Christ to the highest place that thought can reach and language express, but it is in the region not of the physical but of the spiritual. Paul is pre-eminently a spiritual thinker. The idea is very persistent in its hold on men's minds that there is some sort of reality which is higher than the spiritual. But Paul certainly had no idea that he was saying less of Christ than might be said, something lower than the highest. Paul knows nothing higher than that if one is in Christ he is a son of God, that if men are in Christ they are at one with one another and all the old barriers have fallen away, that if one is in Christ there is a new creation. He knows no higher interpretation of the spirit of God than that it is the spirit of Christ. It is the love of Christ that works the supreme wonder in human life, the creation of men who live not to themselves and seek not their own, and so the creation of a new human society, a new world.

Paul is a spiritual thinker, and nothing proves this more convincingly than his thinking about Christ. It is a constant wonder and delight to find him subjecting all sorts of thoughts, both Hebrew and Greek in character, to the fact of Christ, and to his purpose and power to form others after his own likeness. With how sure an instinct he refuses to find Christ a problem which requires something else for its solution. How certain he is that Christ is the solution of the problems of life. Christ is supreme in the religious thinking of Paul, and his place is higher, not lower, because what he is we also are to be. His high thoughts about the Christian do not mean that he has less than the highest thoughts about Christ; and this is true because in the light of Christ Paul knows that the highest thoughts and the highest realities are those of love. It is because of his strong hold upon that knowledge that Paul's thought moves away from the particular toward the universal, and that in a certain strange and bold manner he humanizes the supernatural, one could almost say spiritualizes the spiritual.

In this spiritualizing aim and purpose of Paul we may find no doubt a certain relief and sense of liberation. It is a relief to the mind to know that we are not under obligation to regard Paul's words as law and to interpret his meanings in literal and outward ways. We are intellectually free, Paul himself being one of the greatest apostles of the freedom with which Christ sets men free. We are free on Paul's own principles and in accordance with Paul's own purpose from bondage to the letter even of Paul himself. We are justified in letting many things go, and in laying hold of that liberty which Paul himself so highly prized as the effect of the Lord who is the spirit. There are many things in Paul of which the historical explanation is all that we feel the need of discovering, for Paul was a man of his time and his time is far past. This is a sort of freedom which Paul emphatically claimed for himself and wished all Christians to share with him. We have seen how far he carried his principle that the Christian should affirm nothing even about Christ upon the authority of others, even if they were apostles, but should believe and affirm only such things as they could make their own and bear witness to because they had experienced them. To follow Paul in the direction of that personal, spiritual understanding of Christ which we have found most characteristic of him is certainly to do only what Paul himself would wish and require us to do, even though it should lead us in various directions into new paths untrodden by him. What Paul would certainly require of us is that we hold fast in all our thinking about Christ to Jesus himself, and that we hold also to that in him which we can verify in ourselves.

But with this we cannot but realize that what Paul requires of us is of the greatest difficulty and puts upon us a responsibility which we may shrink from undertaking. Paul's concern for himself and for others was the attainment of the knowledge of Christ, not the knowledge that belongs to the wise because of their wisdom, but that which is accessible to all men on the condition that they have Christ in them, and that they are striving to be in Christ. To know Christ was to Paul to know the love of Christ, and that is a knowledge which passes knowledge, an attainment so high that Paul can only say that it means being filled unto all the fulness of God. If Paul's thinking about Christ is for us freed from the intellectual difficulties which the older doctrinal interpretations of him involved, there are moral and spiritual difficulties in it which challenge the highest of our efforts, and may sometimes make us wish that we could return to the lesser difficulty of giving assent to his words as authoritative and final. There are indeed more ways than one in which Christians have looked for escape from the hard ideals of so inward and so free a religion as that of Paul.

Paul would have us know the love of Christ, but love above all other things is something that can be known only by those who possess it. The knowledge of Christ which Paul sought was the sort of knowledge that belongs only to personal communion, to inner likeness. The love of Christ can be known only by one who is constrained by it. It can be imparted only by one who embodies it in himself. The Christian, if Paul is right in defining him as one who has Christ within him, and one who is in Christ, cannot escape, however much he would like to do so, the requirement and the inherent necessity that he express what Christ is to him by that which he himself is. "Be ye imitators of me, even as I am of Christ." Remember and follow "my ways which are in Christ Jesus." Paul succeeds in saying such things in ways which do not give offense, or should not, since he always makes it clear that whenever and in whatever measure one is like Christ the glory is wholly Christ's, not his own. His words convince us also that his mind was not upon himself, but on those to whom he was writing, for whom he is anxious beyond every other anxiety that they have the mind that was in Christ, that Christ be formed within them.

It is not an easier thing to put Christ in the place in our lives in which Paul put him, than it is to put him in the place in our theology in which the creeds and dogmas have put him. But the hard thing in Paul is after all not different from the hard thing in the teachings of Jesus; and there can be no real discipleship which does not face and accept the harder things. One must deny himself and take up his cross if he is to follow Christ. One must suffer with Christ if he is to understand the sufferings of Christ, must die with him if he is to know the meaning of his death, must experience the power of his resurrection by his own rising to newness of life if he is to know for himself the fact and the meaning of the resurrection of Christ.

Of all the ways in which men have tried to escape the high ideal and difficult demands of Christ and of Paul the most dangerous have been those Christologies which are called high because of the distance by which they separate Christ from men, because they make Christianity the assent to the assertion of great things about Christ, and not the attainment of great things according to Christ and with him. But no Christology which involves that danger can be called Pauline. To Paul "Christ in me" could indeed mean Christ for me, Christ in my place; but the Christian must say also, "I in Christ," and must mean by it, I in Christ's place, in his person, I for him. The only Christology that Paul urges and about which he is anxious is not a Christology, for it is the expression of Christ's nature and the proof of his divineness, not in words, but in lives; it is the witness that Christians bear to what Christ was by what he is in them and by what they are in him.

OUTLINE OF TOPICS

I. Theological bearing of historical studies, 3–5.
  Ways of approach to the historical Jesus, 5–12.
  Paul's letters as sources of our knowledge of Jesus, 12–29.
  Paul himself as a witness to the fact and the nature of Jesus, 29–40.
II. The transition from Jesus in history to Jesus in the Christian, 45–48.
  The Christian as Christ's presence and as in his place, 49–62.
  The Spirit as mediating the transition from Christ to the Christian, 62–72.
    Hebrew and Greek meanings of spirit, 64–67.
    Paul's subjection of spirit to Jesus, 67–72.
  The Spirit and Christ, 72–77 (cf. IV. 7).
  The Spirit and the Christian. The nature of the oneness of the Christian with Christ, 77–83.
  Originality of Paul's interpretation of spirit by Christ, 83–85.
  Spirituality of Paul's Christianity and its likeness to the religion of Jesus, 85–91.
III. Paul's thinking according to Christ
      about God, 96–98.
      about man, 98.
  The transition from the Hebrew to the Greek world. Paul's attitude toward Greek Christian theology, 98–123.
    The hymn to Christian wisdom, 106–115.
    The Stoic Christian creed, 115–121 (cf. 172–179).
  Paul's theology Hebrew, not Greek, 123–127.
  His thinking about predestination, 128–129; about life after death, 129–132.
IV. 1. The nature of Paul's knowledge of Christ, 137–143.
  Thinking about Jesus according to Jesus himself, 143–146.

Thinking about Jesus according to the Christian, 146–149.
The place of Christ in the plan of God, 149–156 (cf. 312–314).
What Christ is to the Christian he became from the resurrection, 159.
Nature of Paul's language about Christ, 159–167.
Four resulting characteristics of Paul's thinking about Christ, 167–168.

2. Pre-existence, Hebrew and Greek, 168–172.
  The Stoic Christian creed, 172–179 (cf. 115–121).
  The Logos Christology of Colossians, 179–200.
    Not Col. 1 : 15–17, but 1 : 18–20 is Paul's Christology, 181–185.
    The place of "all things" in the Logos Christology and in Paul's thought of Christ, of the Christian, and of God, 185–195.
    How the Logos verses may have come to be in Colossians, 197–200.
  The Christology of Ephesians, 200–203.
3. The Philippian hymn to Christ in contrast to the Logos Christology, 204–206.
  That Paul quoted a hymn not his own, 206–219.
  Why he did so, 219–221.
  The "higher Christology" of Paul. Criticisms of current opinions, 221–228.
4. That Paul interprets Lord by Jesus, not Jesus by Lord, 228–233.
  "The Lord is the spirit" means the subjection of Lord to Jesus, 233–240.
5. Is Christ separated from men by his death and resurrection? 240–242.
  The present and the future resurrection of the Christian with Christ. The Christology of I Cor. 15, 242–257.
6. The sonship of Christ and the sonship of Christians, 258–262.
  Does pre-existence belong to the sonship of Christ? 263–271.
  Distinctions of the sonship of Christ which do not separate him in the end from men, 271–274.

    - The difference here between Paul and John, 272–274 (cf. 156, 181, 302 f.).
7. That Paul interprets spirit by Jesus, not Jesus by spirit, 274–276.
    - That spirit unites Christ and the Christian, and is not a Hebrew parallel to the Greek Logos Christology, 276–281.
    - The Christ-mysticism of Paul; the phrase, "in Christ Jesus," 282–303.
        - Not a local or physical, but a personal conception, 282–284.
        - Not Greek but Hebrew, 284–286.
        - Not properly mystical, 286–292.
        - Relation between "Christ in us" and "we in Christ," 292–303.
    - Paul's "new creation" and ours, 303–309.
    - Christ's place in the purpose of God determined by interpreting that purpose according to Christ, 310–314.
    - Paul a spiritual thinker, 314–316.
    - The responsibility which Paul's Christianity puts upon us, 316–319.

NOTE

For a fuller discussion of the distinction between the Hebrew and the Greek ideas of the soul and of pre-existence (pp. 64–67, 168–171, 245 f.) the author may refer to his essay on "The Pre-existence of the Soul in the Book of Wisdom and in the Rabbinical Writings," in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies* in Memory of Wm. Rainy Harper, 1908, vol. I, pp. 205–270. See especially pp. 210–217.

PASSAGES ESPECIALLY TREATED

Romans—
- 1 : 3–4 263–266
- 7–8 60–62
- 8 : 3 267–271
- 8 : 1–11 292–297
- 8 : 12–17, 18–25 . . 258–262
- 8 : 35–39 . . 119–120, 240 f.

I Corinthians—
- 1–4 . . . . 99–115, 178 f.
- 2 : 6–16 106–115
- 3 : 21–23 186–191
- 4 : 6–17 . . . . 33–34, 105
- 8 115–121
- 8 : 6 . 117–121, 172–179, 222
- 10 : 4 279–280
- 12–14 . . . . . 68–69, 275–276
- 13 . . . . 69, 121–122
- 15 . . . . 129, 189 f., 242–257

II Corinthians—
- 1–7 49–60
- 3 233–238
- 5 : 11–7 : 4. 297–303, 214 f.
- 6 : 9–10 191
- 8 : 9 213–215
- 10–13 . . . . 34–40, 232

Galatians—
- 3 : 23–4 : 7 258–262
- 4 : 4 267

Colossians—
- 1 : 15–17 . 179–200, 221–228
- 3 : 1–17 . . . . 80–81, 182–183

Philippians—
- 2 : 1–11 . . 204–221, 221–228
- 3 : 4–21 . . 81–83, 122–123, 153–154, 215–219, 231–232

AUTHORS CITED

Bevan, Edwyn, 123–125.
Bousset, 230, 235–239, 283–284.
Deissmann, 282–283, 301.
Dibelius, 181–182.
Dobschütz, 284.
Edwards, Jonathan, 48, 69, 71, 87.
Harnack, 38–39, 45.
Lohmeyer, 207–209, 223 n.
McGiffert, 73.
Norden, 172, 180 (cf. 117).
Reitzenstein, 166.
Schweitzer, 310–312 n.
Weiss, J., 248, 279.
Windelband, 284.
Windisch, 225–226.
Wrede, 224–225.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01198 5878

A